ornia
al

Ex Libris
C. K. OGDEN

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/firstprincipleso00coopiala

THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF CIVIL and ECCLESIASTICAL GOVERNMENT, DELINEATED, (IN TWO PARTS,) IN LETTERS TO Dr. PRIESTLEY, OCCASIONED BY HIS TO Mr. BURKE.

By SAMUEL COOPER, D. D.
MINISTER OF GREAT YARMOUTH.

——Οὐκ ἄρα, ὦ βελτιστε, πάνυ ἡμῖν ἄτω Φροντιστέον ὅ, τι ἐρῶσιν οἱ πολλοὶ ἡμᾶς, ἀλλ' ὅ, τι ὁ ἐπαΐων περί των δικαίων καὶ ἀδίκων, ὁ εἷς, καὶ αὐτή ἡ ἀλήθεια. ὥςε πρῶτον μεν ταύτη ἐκ ὀρθῶς εἰσηγῇ, εἰσηγεμενος τῆς τῶν πολλῶν δόξης δειν ἡμᾶς Φροντιζειν περί τῶν δικαίων καί καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν, καί τῶν ἐναντίων.

YARMOUTH:
PRINTED BY DOWNES AND MARCH,
For Messrs. ROBINSONS, and T. BECKET, LONDON;
And ELLIOT and KAY, EDINBURGH.

M. DCC. XCI.

JC
176
C787f

THE PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT, DELINEATED.

PART THE FIRST, ON CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

—— et ordinem
Rectum evaganti frena licentiæ
Injecit, ——

—— non furor
Civilis, aut vis exiget OTIUM
Non ira, quæ procudit enses
Et miseras inimicat urbes.

HOR.

1906420

LETTERS

TO THE

Rev. Dr. PRIESTLEY.

LETTER I.

SIR,

AS ſoon as I had read *Mr. Burke's* juſtly celebrated "*Reflections,*" I entertained no doubt, but that you would attempt to anſwer them, before I ſaw your declaration of ſuch an intention, publickly announced in the newſpapers. Do not however imagine, that I am ſo abſurd as to think, that ſuch a diſcovery is a proof either of any uncommon ſagacity, or laborious application of mind; as it only required for it's foundation, ſome attention to

 the

1916420

the ideal channels, through which, your multifarious writings have generally flowed. For even a very ſlight obſervation, is all which is neceſſary to enable any one to diſcover, that you are *(in Biſhop Warburton's phraſe)* "*An Anſwerer by Profeſſion,*" to every work, written in defence of the preſent civil and eccleſiaſtical government of this country. A conſtitution of government, which under the liberal ſhelter of it's wide extended branches protects you, from every ſtorm and blaſt of perſecution; and affords to every unhappy wanderer in exile, or even outcaſt from all religions, a ſecure retreat, in which, he may eat his bread in comfort, peace, liberty, and ſafety.

I have now at length read your promiſed publication, though I was for ſome time prevented by a variety of avocations, from indulging myſelf in that pleaſure, for which I ſo eagerly wiſhed. And, as I had not been before deceived in my expectation,

of

of ſeeing *ſome* anſwer from you; ſo likewiſe I am not now in the leaſt diſappointed, in finding it to be, *ſuch* an anſwer, as it is. For, exactly the ſame obſervation, which ſupplied me with the grounds of probability for the one, equally furniſhed me with the means of conjecturing, what would be the materials, and texture of the other.

But, impatient however as I was to examine the work itſelf; my attention was for ſome time unwillingly detained, in the contemplation of the *mottos* which adorn the title-page. For I have been totally at a loſs to conceive, what could poſſibly be your intention, purport, or deſign, in blazoning the front of your pamphlet with thoſe ſentences. The moſt proper motive, which, I conceive, can prompt a writer to prefix a motto to a work; is, to induce his readers to embrace the ſentiments which he holds, by ſhowing, that they are likewiſe the opinions of another, to whom, from

a juſtly acquired authority, more deference is due, than to the author himſelf. But this motive appears to me, to be totally inapplicable to the preſent caſe. Becauſe, the mottos were taken from Mr. Burke's *own* "*Reflections*," which it was your profeſſed deſign to refute; and conſequently therefore to prove them to be ſo far from having any claim to deference, that they were not even entitled to any one's aſſent. But, with this deſign in view, to quote Mr. Burke as an *Oracle*, from whoſe ſentence there was no appeal; ſeems to me to be as unaccountable a conduct, as his would be, who, after having boaſted of his ſkill and courage, and even challenged another to a duel, ſhould, at the very moment, he was accoutred for the combat, inſtantly confeſs the invincible powers of his antagoniſt, ſeize his adverſary's ſword, and by plunging it into his own breaſt, commit a deſperate act of ſuicide.

What

What then Sir, could poſſibly be your intention, in quoting theſe ſentences, or axioms from Mr. Burke, appears to me to be totally inexplicable, upon any principles of reaſon, and ſound ſenſe. To evince, that this declaration neither contains an aſſertion deſtitute of proof, nor implies a cenſure unſupported by juſtice, permit me, to tranſcribe the mottos.

"*Eloquence may exiſt without a proportion-*
"*able degree of wiſdom.*"

"*Steady independent minds, when they have*
"*an object of ſo ſerious a concern to man-*
"*kind as* GOVERNMENT, *under their con-*
"*templation, will diſdain to aſſume the part*
"*of* SATIRISTS *and* DECLAIMERS."

As to the *latter* motto, it is I muſt confeſs, the very laſt, which I ſhould have conceived, *prudence* would have ſuffered you to have choſen. For it can ſerve no

other

other purpoſe, than to ſhow, that you ſtand ſelf condemned by your own quotations; as every one at all converſant with your writings, muſt know, that they *abound* in ſatire and declamation upon the government of your country; if indeed it be admitted, that compoſitions are entitled to thoſe appellations, which contain groſs invectives without wit, and bold aſſertions without elegance.

As to the FIRST, that, "*eloquence* MAY exiſt *without a proportionable degree of wiſdom*," this is certainly as true, as that Mr. Burke poſſeſſes one of the higheſt degrees of eloquence, which was ever the portion of any human mind. And conſequently, ſuch a maxim coming from one ſo well qualified by his own unrivalled eloquence and conſummate wiſdom, to form a judgement upon this point, it muſt neceſſarily make a very forcible impreſſion upon the minds of others. But then, the quotation ſtill only ſerves to promulgate

promulgate *Mr. Burke's* AUTHORITY, NOT YOURS; the latter of which in this caſe, required ſupport, even to the demolition of his. Was the inſertion of it then owing, to one of thoſe miſtakes, to which you have been ſo ſubject, in your "*Corruptions of the* "*Hiſtory of Chriſtianity?*" I beg your pardon, I believe the *title*, which you give to it, is, the *Hiſtory of the Corruptions of Chri-* "*ſtianity.*

It may be poſſible, that in the "*rapid* "*glance,*" which according to your uſual practice, you took of Mr. Burke's book, you read it THUS, "*eloquence* NEVER EX- "ISTS *with a proportionate degree of wiſdom.*" If this was the fact, *then* indeed you have quoted it with the moſt ſingular propriety; as thinking, you condemned Mr. Burke out of his own mouth. But then your printer, by correcting the miſtake in the words of the ſentence, has moſt unfortunately obliterated all meaning from it's application.

Or,

Or, did the miſtake ariſe, not from any imperfection in your SIGHT, but from the much greater misfortune, of a cataract forming upon your REASON? Did you conclude, that if, eloquence MAY exiſt without a proportionable degree of knowledge, it neceſſarily MUST do ſo in *Mr. Burke?* Now though this can never be admitted as a legitimate deduction, till every juſt principle of *logic* be firſt deſtroyed, yet even an aſſent to this inference, would neither diminiſh Mr. Burke's authority, nor increaſe yours. For even ſtrip him of all his eloquence, which kills at every ſtroke, and leave him only his wiſdom; he would ſtill be but like Pallas robbed of her ſpear, but whoſe Ægis alone will ſtrike her opponents dumb in confuſion, horror, and diſmay.* But

* Mr. Burke will I hope excuſe me if I make an exception, in reſpect to the impeachment of Mr. Haſtings, where he ſeems to have dipped the point of his ſpear in venom, and to have thrown away his ſhield.

But perhaps, as none of the ſuppoſitions which I have already made, can furniſh even a ſhadow of a reaſon for your adoption of this firſt motto; there may ſtill be another inference, which you may have deduced from it, which may appear to you, to evince the much greater deference due to the authority of your name, than to that of Mr. Burke. For, as it is allowed, that eloquence MAY EXIST without a *proprotionable* degree of wiſdom, you may perhaps therefore conclude, that in that mind, in which, NO ELOQUENCE EXISTS, there MUST BE the HIGHEST DEGREE of WISDOM. And indeed, if this did not happen to be an inference, which a Tyro in the Soph's Schools at Cambridge, would laugh at as a deduction from ſuch premiſes, (no wonder therefore you lament in your letters, that the youth of your perſuaſion are not admitted into our Univerſities) it would undoubtedly, hold forth to you, the palm of ſuperiority, and the garland of victory. For

 though

though it muſt be confeſſed, that numbers can not forbear to lament, that your writings are much too barren in argument, too fertile in invective, and too copious in aſſertion,—it muſt likewiſe be acknowledged, that no one was ever daring enough, to have the injuſtice to accuſe you, of exhibiting in them at any time, even the faintest glimmer, of the dimmeſt ray of ELOQUENCE.

What renders this laſt conjecture of mine, the more probable, is, that this deduction which I now ſuppoſe you to have made, appears to be not only a current opinion, but even an univerſally received axiom amongſt all thoſe living authors, who are either honoured with encomiums from your pen, or who offer up incenſe at your ſhrine.

It was indeed formerly ſuppoſed, that an UNION, of the faculties of MEMORY, IMAGINATION, WIT, JUDGEMENT, REASONING,

REASONING, SAGACITY, INTELLECT, and of INVENTION, long employed in deep thinking and profound inveſtigation, could alone qualify any one to become a writer; and that as every man's ſmalleſt pretence to literary reputation, muſt be founded upon ſome participation of theſe qualities, ſo, the reſpective degrees in fame, to which different individuals were entitled, muſt be eſtimated, by the various rays, into which their genius could be reſolved, when diſentangled from the almoſt infinite variety of modes of combination, in which thoſe rays are capable of being blended.

Upon theſe principles it is, that HOMER and VIRGIL, DEMOSTHENES and CICERO, SOCRATES, PLATO, and ARISTOTLE, SHAKESPEAR and MILTON, BACON and BERKLEY, NEWTON and LOCKE, muſt be elevated to the higheſt ſeats in the temple of fame.

But, the great LIBERALITY of SENTIMENT, of the preſent age, of which, we hear from you, and other writers, ſuch frequent and juſt encomiums, has, very kindly diſpenſed with the neceſſity, of ſetting forth a title to genius, by means, which demand ſo much labour from the claimants, and require ſo much nice diſcrimination in the judges. For, the preſent enlightened age, juſtly ſo denominated as every ſchool boy knows upon claſſical authority, (as, *Lucus a non lucendo,)* have found, ſome nearer, though crooked and ſubterraneous paths to the temple of fame. By paſſing along theſe, and by frequent and importunate applications at the doors of ſome of the lower offices of the fane, they gain free admittance, and are ſoon led up by a ſecret aſcent into the moſt ſpacious and ſplendid apartments of the place. Whilſt they, who by the *plain* and *direct* path approach the central door, which always ſtands open, and enter without courting the porter,

ter, are obliged to remain crouded in the narrow entries and paſſages of the edifice. But no ſooner has Death with Time aſſerted their claims, than the latter, by their ætherial nature mount aloft, and are then venerated as the guides, the guardians, and enlighteners, of mankind. Whilſt the putrid carcaſes of the former, are thrown out in ſcornful ſilence, to be devoured by the fowls of the air, and the beaſts of the field, unleſs ſome future author, ſhould from mere pity and compaſſion, afterwards gather their ſcattered limbs together;—place them in the niches of ſome future *Biographia Britannica*,—and embalm them,—with all the gums and unguents,—which beſmear the bodies of Egyptian Kings.

This is one of the happy improvements, which we owe, to the flood of light, poured in upon us, in modern times. So that even you Sir, who, are now upon theſe principles, upborn upon the ſtrongeſt waxened

wings

wings of modern fame, and who, if we believe your own writings, are much wiſer than the Apoſtles; even you, need never to be in fear, leſt you ſhould be rebuked with the cenſure that the apoſtle Paul was, that "*much learning has made you mad.*"

But, were there indeed another GREY to appear, who had with much application ſo ſtrengthened, and cultivated his native vigour, as with eaſe to vault upon the back of Pegaſus, and could turn and manage him as he pleaſed; HE would be hooted at by the majority, and miſtaken for a Centaur. Or, were another BERKELEY to ariſe, and pour forth the ſtreams which he had imbibed from the very depth of the Pierian Spring, too refined for the taſte, and too ſubtle for the palate of modern times; his genius, would with all the delicacy of modern wit be ridiculed; and his inſpirations be ſtigmatized, and condemned, as the intoxicating fumes of the

inſpiring

inſpiring Bacchus, or as the frantic ravings of the Pythian Prieſteſs.

Though the diſcovery, which I have already related, be certainly the brighteſt which has been made by the moderns, yet it muſt not be concealed, that there is another, which indeed followed from it as a conſequence; and which truly if not quite ſo ingenious, is at leaſt equally uſeful.

For it has been found, that the world is at preſent ſo ſaturated with knowledge and wiſdom, that BOOK-WRITING is no longer therefore of any value; and it has therefore been ingeniouſly reſolved to ſubſtitute, in it's place,—BOOK-MAKING. Nothing certainly can redound more to the honour of the *humanity* of the preſent times, than this reſolution of ſaving all expence of thought, and conſequently all the fatigue of mind, and maceration of the body, which

ſo

ſo much harraſſed the antients. For by this admirable diſcovery, every one now who can but read, is rendered qualified at once, to become a critic, and an author.

In the ſcience of BOOK-MAKING, there are however certainly two degrees, which are often confounded by the vulgar. For, the ſame terms of commendation, viz. of ingenuity, and of learning, are often indiſcriminately beſtowed upon both; not a doubt being entertained whether thoſe terms, are with juſtice, applicable to either. The one ſpecies, ſo little requires the uſe of a pen; that any one who was never even taught to write, may riſe in it, to the very apex of fame. A ſtrong inſtrument of iron, whether faſhioned into the form of a knife, or of ſciſſars, if it be but able to cut the works of other writers in pieces, and ſome flour and water, condenſed into paſte firm enough to join together again the "*diſjecti* "*Membra Poetæ,*" are all the acquiſitions which

which are requiſite for any one, who would reach the higheſt excellence in this branch of the art. The other, it muſt be confeſſed, demands from it's cultivators, a little more labour. For in this caſe, the perſon who would impart food to others, muſt firſt ſwallow it himſelf; and then, before it has at all contributed to his own nutrition, he muſt with ſome pains and ſtruggles diſgorge it, and arrange it in ſome decent order, ſo that the heterogeneous morſels may not offend the ſtomachs of his gueſts. Or, perhaps, this latter ſpecies of BOOK-MAKING, may with more decorum be compared, to thoſe paſteboards which are invented for the uſe of children, and are called *geographical diſſected maps*. Theſe, whilſt they are ſhut up in their boxes, are a mere "*rudis indigeſtaque Moles*," exactly reſembling the juxta poſition of the ideas of a book-maker, while depoſited in his memory; but both which, the moſt ignorant, may by a very ſlight operation, and conſequently

ſequently one very eaſily learned, without knowing any thing of the boundaries and relations of countries in the one, or of the connection between the ſciences in the other, arrange in ſuch order, as to teach ſomething at leaſt by this mechanic proceſs; which, the weakneſs of the learners intellects, would be incapable of acquiring, by a ſcientific progreſſion.

I truſt Sir, that YOU, do not conceive me to be at all wandering from the particular ſubject of my addreſs, by this ſhort, but juſt account of the diſcoveries of modern authors; as it has certainly the cloſeſt connection with your Letters to *Mr. Burke*.* He being a writer entitled to fame, only

* By modern Authors, I hope it will be underſtood, I mean only, certain writers in the Southern parts of this Iſle. For, in the more Northern, the Authors when they err, err ingeniouſly; ſtill continuing to habituate themſelves to much deep thinking;

only upon the old exploded claim of the antients. Whilſt you, Sir, are at once the great diſcoverer, and grand exemplar of the much more illuſtrious modification of the claim, by the moderns. You ſtanding indiſputably the firſt in fame amongſt the preſent claſs of writers, which I have been laſt deſcribing; not only for the excellence, but likewiſe, without even excepting Dr. Hill of famous memory, for the multiplicity, and multifariouſneſs of your works.

But ſhould you perchance at preſent, deny that there is any connection, between this delineation and the ſubject of your letters, I do not deſpair in my progreſs, to make even *you* for once confeſs, that *you* are *miſtaken;* notwithſtanding your conſtant habit of congratulating yourſelf upon a vic-

 tory,

thinking; they have as yet exhibited, but few traits of their neighbours wonderful improvements, in the craft, art, trade, and myſtery of BOOK-MAKING.

tory, and of ordering your followers to ſing *Io Pæan*, when all the reſt of the world are witneſſes of your defeat.* I am perſuaded the film will ſoon be ſo entirely removed from before your eyes, that you will ſee, "*Luce clariùs*," that the foregoing obſervations, not only form a proper introduction to an examination of your letters, but that the examination itſelf, will likewiſe illuſtrate, and confirm the obſervations. Both of them, by their mutual attraction, giving durability to each others coheſion, and adding ſolidity to each others weight.

Before, however, I conclude this letter, it may not perhaps be unneceſſary to obviate a charge, with which, I may very probably be arraigned in my account of the

* See the Controverſy between the Biſhop of St. David, and Dr. Prieſtley.

the genius, and invention, of the preſent times. To have paſſed by unnoticed, the purſuits of ELECTRICITY and CHEMISTRY, which not only ſo much occupy the attention of the preſent age, but which, it is conceived, will entitle it to the higheſt celebrity in future times, it will perhaps be ſaid, could only ariſe either from the groſſeſt ignorance, or the moſt flagrant injuſtice. But I can moſt ſolemnly aſſure ſuch accuſers, that no one, is more ready than I am, to beſtow on ſuch reſearches, all the praiſe which is due to them; and that no one would more rejoice than I ſhould, to ſee them ſo far purſued, that from the collection of a multitude of particular facts, ſuch principles ſhall be educed, as will ſupply firm foundations, for the erection of thoſe faſhionable ſtudies, into *fabrics* of *ſcience*. Though I cannot however forbear at the ſame time, moſt ſincerely to lament, that other ſciences have hitherto received much injury from the preſent fond predilection,

lection, and warm partiality in favour of thoſe purſuits. For, whilſt their almoſt bigotted admirers, have had, not the work of *Architects*, but only as it were of *Labourers* to perform, having had more call for the uſe of their hands and eyes, than of their REASON and INTELLECT, yet the fame which has been beſtowed upon them by the kind indulgence of a partial public, has ſo inflated them with the conceit of their own merit, greatneſs, and importance, as to make them think themſelves entitled to dogmatize upon far different ſubjects, which are founded upon a very different ſpecies of knowledge, than what they have really acquired; and requires the employment of very different faculties, from thoſe, which they were wont to exerciſe. This falſe conceit however, it muſt be confeſſed, ought not to be conſidered as the peculiar characteriſtic of this age and country. For though now BERKELEY is gone, we ſhall ſearch in vain for *another Plato*, yet even

in

in this divine Philoſopher's time, we find, that the ſame partiality for experiments upon ſenſible objects, had occaſioned the ſame delirium at Athens, as it has ſince produced in England. For, HE tells us, there were even then, SOME MEN, who FANCIED themſelves to be PHILOSOPHERS, "*who would not believe*, THAT *could be* ANY-"THING, *which they could not* GRASP *with* "*their* HANDS, *and who would not liſten to* "*a Philoſopher, who ſpoke to them of* ANY-"THING, *which was* NOT BODY." *

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

* See Plato in Sophiſta, and Prieſtley's Diſquiſition on Matters and Spirit, &c.

ERRATUM.—Page 10, laſt l. after *Imagination*, add TASTE.

LETTER

LETTER II.

SIR,

THOUGH I am ſo unfortunate, as to entertain an opinion, that your firſt, and ſecond Letter, reſemble batteries, which are ſo feeble in their conſtruction, and ſo ill ſupplied with ammunition, that an adverſary may ſafely paſs them by, regardleſs of every annoyance, they can poſſibly give to his forces in their march,—I truſt to your *good nature*, and *meekneſs* for pardon. For, if I ſhould boldly advance with my troops, at once to attack your principal forts, there to encounter your utmoſt ſtrength, and ſhould miſcarry in my deſign; mine, would be, the defeat, and ſhame; yours, the triumph,

triumph, and glory. Should I however ſucceed, I ſhall perhaps return, and then demoliſh thoſe batteries; which, for their weakneſs, I before neglected; and if I am right in my firſt conjecture, I ſhall, I think, find, that mere firing off ſome of their guns, will cauſe them to tumble into pieces, even by the mere force of the recoil.

ONE of your PRINCIPAL FORTS, which by ſtanding firſt, is moſt prominent to the ſight, is called, "THE NATURE OF GOVERN-"MENT, OR THE RIGHTS OF MEN AND OF "KINGS." Now the forces, which you have brought together, as the ſole ſupport, upon which you rely for it's defence; ſeem to be, the moſt extraordinary, that *any* one who vaunts himſelf upon his abilities, as a general, could poſſibly have ſelected. And even ſtill more extraordinary is it, that of all men, YOU, in particular, ſhould have choſen them, who pride yourſelf upon al-

ways carrying on *your polemics*, under the banner of REASON. For, it is, by that *power's* peculiar predilection for you, the ſupplies which it lends to you alone, and it's panoply with which it has always covered you, that you boaſt, you have become victorious in all your engagements, and have trampled underfoot,—Infidels,—Jews,—Chriſtians,—Biſhops,—and Apoſtles.

But, it is now time perhaps, to drop all metaphor; and quote the plain language (for ſo it is in this place) of your Pamphlet.

You begin, with telling Mr. Burke, that, "conſidering how much has been written "on the ſubject of government, ſince the "revolution in this country, which more "than any thing contributed to open the "eyes of Engliſhmen, with reſpect to the "true principles of it, it is not a little "extraordinary that any man of *reading*

"and

"and *reflection* as he is, ſhould depart "from them ſo much as he has done."

The only obſervation, which I ſhall make upon this paſſage at preſent, is, that the inſerting of the word "*Reflection*" which it contains; ſeems to have ariſen from a mere ſlip of your pen. For, we muſt neceſſarily infer, only from the next paragraph but one; that you do NOT think it *extraordinary*, that Mr. Burke, ſhould have deviated from thoſe principles, by the aid of "*Reflection*;" but, that as this was in reality, the cauſe of his departure from them: that he is in your opinion, for that very reaſon, deſerving of cenſure,—becauſe he *did reflect* upon them, and not *take* them *for granted*; as *you* think, he *ought* to have done.

For, after laying down what you ſuppoſe to be the fundamental principle of government, according to Lord Somers, Mr. Locke,

and Biſhop Hoadley, you ſay, (addreſſing yourſelf to Mr. Burke.)

"You, Sir, do not directly, and in ſo "many words deny theſe great principles "of all government, or the general con- "cluſion drawn from them. In fact, you "admit them *all* when you allow, page 87, "that *civil ſociety* is made for the *advantage* "of man." "But you advance what is re- "ally inconſiſtent with theſe leading prin- "ciples, and you would *tie up our hands* "from making any *effectually uſe of them.* "You ſeem to have forgotten, what you "muſt have formerly learned; but *it is* "*too late for us to go to ſchool* again, and "*relearn the firſt elements of political ſcience.* "What our *predeceſſors* took great pains to "PROVE, *we now* receive as AXIOMS, and "WITHOUT HESITATION ACT *upon them.*"

Now, however divided men may be in their ſentiments upon this Paragraph, in reſpect

reſpect to it's truth, ſo far as it contains a charge againſt Mr. Burke, and the reaſons upon which, you have grounded it; yet I doubt not, but they will be as unanimouſly free from heſitation, in *believing* this laſt declaration, of yours, reſpecting yourſelf and your friends, as you, and any of them can poſſibly be in *making* and *acting*, in the ſtricteſt conformity with it.

In reference to Mr. Burke, this Paragraph certainly, upon firſt "*looking through* "*it*," appears to accuſe him only of *forgetfulneſs* of thoſe principles, which you ſuppoſe him to have forſaken. But if, to our looking, we add the ſlighteſt conſideration upon it, we ſee moſt clearly, that it alſo contains (as I juſt now hinted) an *equal* condemnation of him, if upon REFLECTION HE has *changed* thoſe ſentiments, which YOU STILL *maintain*. For, by the declaration of your own conduct, you cenſure that man as unwiſe, who examines afterwards

terwards, what he was taught at ſchool, and condemn it as an impropriety in an old man, even to DOUBT the truth of an opinion, which, he had learned, when he was a boy. This certainly is an idea, diametrically oppoſite to the ſentiments, and practice of the wiſeſt of the antients, which likewiſe every ſchool-boy muſt have been taught, who, has made even but a very ſmall progreſs in learning; but, which it ſeems, YOU, YOURSELF with all your predilection for your infant knowledge, and cenſure, upon Mr. Burke, for his ſuppoſed failing in this reſpect;—have either forgotten, or diſcarded.

Whether therefore, Mr. B's dereliction of his youthful principles, have ariſen from the ſterility of his preſent memory, or the copiouſneſs of his manly Reflections, neither cauſe, is ſufficiently unuſual, to excite either wonder, or ſurpriſe. The one, I muſt confeſs, from the vaſt treaſures, which

we

we ſee Mr. B. continually bringing forth from the repoſitory of his memory, does not appear to me, to be the real cauſe, though you have aſſigned it. And the other, has always been eſteemed, deſerving of the higheſt approbation, except by *Popes* and *Cardinals*, 'till *you* condemned it. That *they* ſhould feel a diſlike to ſuch a conduct, we cannot wonder, becauſe there ſeems to be the moſt perfect *elective attraction*, between that ſentiment, and their other religious opinions. But that you, Sir, ſhould expreſs the ſlighteſt tendency to ſuch a ſentiment, that you ſhould embrace ſuch a tenet, and deliver ſuch a dogma, as the quotation from your own letter contains, muſt excite in every one, not only the higheſt degree of ſurpriſe, but likewiſe of aſtoniſhment. You, Sir, whoſe other principles and conduct are of ſuch a kind, that not only ſuch a ſentiment, can never produce with them, the ſmalleſt effect of a *chemical ſolution*, but muſt by their mutual

tual repulſion burſt the containing veſſel. You, Sir, whoſe *theological* lucubrations are founded upon a maxim, the very *reverſe* of this; I mean, the *actually unlearning*, as you advance into the winter of age, ALL that you were taught, in the ſeaſon of youth.

It would be a curious ſpeculation to inveſtigate, and I doubt not but noble fruit, would be the reward of the labour, were any one to diſcover, from whence has ariſen this inveterate prejudice of yours, in favour of the writers upon *government*, and your prejudice equally ſtrong againſt the writers, upon the *New Teſtament*? What has made you, a thus open and declared *bigot* to the *infallibility* of LOCKE, and ſtill more and more a *ſceptic* as to the *authority* of CHRIST, and his APOSTLES? Surely we may apply to you the obſervation of Horace, "nil fuit unquam "tam impar ſibi;" for, without meaning to give you any offence, ſuch a character muſt be

be uncommon; and whatever is uncommon, uſually excites our admiration.

But Sir, I can ſo eaſily conceive, that Mr. Burke may differ from *Mr. Locke's* principles in his treatiſe on government, without *forgetting* them, that I am utterly unable to conceive, how they can poſſibly be admitted by any one, who has been previouſly habituated to much thought and deep reflection, before he happens to read them, either in conſequence of his own choice, or in obedience to the command of his tutor. That Mr. Locke, muſt always ſtand deſervedly very high, in the temple of fame, it would be folly or injuſtice to deny. But, that he was *not* ALWAYS *clear* in his *firſt principles*, nor *right* in his *deductions* from them, even in ANY of his works, and *more particularly* in thoſe, upon CIVIL GOVERNMENT, may be aſſerted with truth, becauſe it is capable of demonſtration. And I muſt confeſs, I was

 ſcarcely

ſcarcely ever more ſurpriſed in my life, when upon reading the ingenious "Eſſays, "(entitled) *philoſophical, hiſtorical,* and *moral,*" I found the Author, I do not mean combating the lively remarks of *Soam Jenyns,* for they are more ludicrous, than convincing; but ſeriouſly defending Locke's notions; "THAT ALL MEN ARE BORN FREE," and alſo "EQUAL;" who at the ſame time, with ſo much ingenuity of obſervation, and force of argument, has refuted what *he* terms, "*the groſs error,*" and the "*egregi-*"*ous blunders*" of Dr. Price.

This ſuppoſed *natural freedom,* and *natural equality* of mankind, are the ſources from which thoſe NATURAL RIGHTS muſt be drawn, of which we hear ſo much, but have been taught ſo little; and which, when the modern great advocates for them, are urged to explain,—inſtead of defining,—they content themſelves with only repeating the words

words over again,—without giving us the ſlighteſt elucidation of their meaning.

Now Sir, as YOU have NOT ventured yourſelf down the WELL, where, TRUTH is ſaid to keep her reſidence at the bottom, and drawn up from thence, *firſt* principles for yourſelf; permit me for a time, to take my leave of you, and to accompany Mr. Locke, for whoſe abilites, I have the higheſt reſpect, though I am not, as you are, "*addictus jurare in verba Magiſtri.*"

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

P. S. You will, I hope, excuſe the liberty I have taken, in tranſpoſing the order, in which, the names of LOCKE and HOADLEY, ſtand in your letter. For, though I have a great reſpect for high rank, I have,

a much greater veneration for ſuperior genius; and therefore I did not chooſe, to put as you have done, the ſcholar before the maſter. Locke was certainly, a great genius, and though I am not diſpoſed, in imitation of you and the Perſians, to worſhip the ſun;—yet, I conſider the rays of Locke's genius, as collected into a focus in his writings, imparting light to Biſhop Hoadley, —like, the beams of the heavenly luminary, concentred in a convex glaſs,—kindling into a *contention*,—between blaze and ſmoke,—ſome of the *mere common ſtubble* of the *field*.

LETTER

LETTER III.

SIR,

I Muſt beg leave to obſerve, that from the firſt moment of my taſting Mr. Locke's principles upon government, they never appeared to me, to have by any means the ſame flavour, with thoſe which come from the well of truth. For when, having firſt carefully ſeparated the ideas annexed, to the words,—"the *natural freedom* and *equa-*"*lity* of *mankind*," from all the extraneous matter mixed with them, and we have put them into a well-cloſed alembic,—we ſhall find the *precipitation* to conſiſt, only of this ſimple, inſipid, *identical propoſition*, as the Logicians term it. Viz. that *whilſt* men live

live in a *ſtate* of *nature*,—which is *prior* to the exiſtence of what we call *civil government*, mens actions are not under any of *thoſe* POLITICAL reſtraints, nor have men themſelves THOSE *diſtinctions* of ſtation, which are *created*, when a government is eſtabliſhed;—which is in fact, only to ſay,—that a ſtate of nature, and a ſtate of government, are *not one*, and the *ſame* ſtate, but *different* ones:—And that the former is therefore, without all rules, laws, and regulations, which exiſt in the latter. Certainly no ghoſt was wanted to tell us this, becauſe it is implied in the very DEFINITIONS of the TERMS. But, I cannot conceive in what *other* ſenſe than the foregoing, it can be ſaid, that "*men are born free*," except it be in this,—which is as little to the purpoſe,—that NATURE, or more properly the GOD of NATURE, has endowed them with FREE-WILL, or a POWER of chooſing one thing, in preference to another. This indeed,

is certainly very true, and is therefore admitted; but the ſole queſtion, relative to the NATURAL FREEDOM of mankind, is, his *natural* freedom, as to the REAL EXERCISE of the POWER of ACTING, in CONSEQUENCE of SUCH a CHOICE. And this, it is manifeſt, is much leſs in a *man's* power *in* a *ſtate* of *nature*, than even in a *ſtate* of *ſociety*. And conſequently his NATURAL, is for the moſt part leſs, than his POLITICAL freedom. For this is the very circumſtance, which from the firſt exerciſe of reaſon, upon long continued experience, prompts men to unite together, and willingly to ſubmit to any, even the *moſt burdenſome reſtraints*, which the very *worſt ſpecies* of *civil government*, can poſſibly lay upon them, as far preferable, to thoſe evils, which they endured in that ſtate of *anarchy*, called, a *ſtate of nature*.

For, it may, with a much nearer approach to truth, be ſaid, of almoſt any

other

other animal, that he is born to *act* as he chuſes; than of MAN. Man being of all animals, *that, which* is, from the *neceſſities* of his nature in the greateſt degree, and for the longeſt time, not merely *accidentally*, but even *neceſſarily ſubject* to the *authority*,—*will*, —and *controul* of it's parents; and which ſubjection continues in a ſtate of nature even ſtill longer, than in a ſtate of ſociety. But when he even becomes emancipated, from that ſubjection, is he not ſtill liable to be thwarted in the indulgence of his wiſhes, and the execution of his intentions, by every one, and therefore ſubject to the controul of every one, who is either *ſtronger*, more *ſkilful*, or more *cunning* than himſelf? For will any one contend, that all men are *born*, and *continue equal* in theſe qualities; any more than in thoſe of ſtature, ſtraitneſs and beauty? In *what reſpect* then, can we find men *born* EQUAL? And conſequently in what *other* ſenſe, than in the quibbling kind of ſenſe. (You will be

ſo

ſo good as to remember the quibble is not mine, but Mr. Locke's,) which I have before mentioned, can they be ſaid to be *born* FREE?

Beſides, it is not only from each ſeparate individual, who is ſtronger than himſelf, that a man's actions are liable to controul, in a *ſtate* of *nature;* but likewiſe, from every deſigned, or caſual *union* of thoſe, who may *each* of them, be *individually* WEAKER.

For pleaſe to look into the country, and there ſee horſes,—cows,—ſheep,—and oxen,—turned into their different paſtures; —even amongſt them, you will find ſome *one*, of each ſpecies, at firſt trying his ſtrength, and afterwards becoming lord, and maſter over the reſt. If one alone however, ſhould prove to be unequal to the conqueſt, you will behold then, *ſome* of the ſtronger,—by union with each other,—keep-

ing the weaker at a diſtance,—and forcing them to be content,—with the very worſt paſture in the field, whilſt the tyrants feed where they pleaſe, and monopolize to themſelves, the beſt and ſweeteſt of the graſs. Take a view of them ſome time afterwards,—when they have gorged themſelves to the full, in the favourite ſpot,—and ſpoiled what they have not eaten,—you will then ſee them driving away the others from the place, where they had before permitted them to graze,—and for a time, will take poſſeſſion of it for themſelves. Juſt ſo, turn out *men* alſo, upon the great COMMON of nature, i. e. conceive them to be placed in a *ſtate* of *nature*, and in what, will conſiſt the difference of their conduct, from that of other animals? In nothing but this,—that in proportion,—as they have a greater ability, to contrive various means of gratifying their paſſions, —proud, covetous, and domineering over their ſpecies, as other animals may be;

MEN WILL BE,—ſtill MORE haughty,—MORE avaricious,—and MORE tyrannical.

Totally unacquainted therefore, with the FIRST PRINCIPLES of GOVERNMENT, do all thoſe appear to me to be, who ſuppoſe it to be founded upon the HAPPINESS, ariſing from this NATURAL *freedom*, and NATURAL *equality* of mankind, if any can be guilty of ſuch an abuſe of words, as ſo to call them. Conſequently therefore moſt egregiouſly miſtaken muſt they be, who in the moſt crab-like, and retrograde procedure, are continually meaſuring back, the RELATIVE PERFECTION of each government; by the degrees of it's approximation, to man's imagined ORIGINAL FREEDOM, and EQUALITY in a *ſtate of nature*.

Where then are we to find, that root of NATURAL RIGHTS, from which, we have been told, the trunk and branches

of all good governments, muſt originally derive, their ſturdy vigour, and umbrageous ſhade.

Perhaps it will be urged, in defence of Mr. Locke; for *you* are not *ſingular* in preferring the *authority* of a *name*, to the *force* of an *argument*;—that though it may be granted,—that ſuch is the turbulence, and violence of a *ſtate of nature*, that in it, man cannot be ſaid to be *born* indeed, to the *actual exerciſe* of freedom; yet nevertheleſs, he may be truly ſaid, to be born with a RIGHT to freedom of action, in conſequence of his free-will.

But, this, is only the ſame as to ſay, in other words, that all men have a RIGHT upon all occaſions, when they chooſe it, to do wrong,—though, all men when they chooſe it, have a RIGHT to prevent it. For, if every man has a right to every thing he CHOOSES, then it follows, that every

every man has a *right* to hurt, or kill every man, when he chooſes; though every man chooſing *not* to be hurt, or killed, has an equal *right* to reſiſt. If this be not NONSENSE, I muſt confeſs, I know not, WHAT IS. So that at laſt, all this cloud of duſt, which has been raiſed by the puffing advocates, for the NATURAL RIGHTS OF MEN, ſettles into this *identical* propoſition, only that man in a ſtate of nature, *can* do a thing, when he has a *power to do it*: or that when he is *not controuled*, he is *free* to *act*.

For, ſuppoſe a man in a ſtate of nature, ſhould attempt to perform an action, which, a ſtronger man than he, FORBIDS him to do, upon pain of loſing his life; —what LAW,—what AUTHORITY,—what RULE,—what PRESCRIPTION,—what PERMISSION, can the weaker plead, for doing it? If, for inſtance, as he is about to carry home the animal, which he himſelf had

had killed in the chace, another who is ſtronger, and has been hunting with him, chuſes to take it from him, what PLEA of RIGHT can the former uſe? If he ſhould urge, that he is hungry, the latter may uſe exactly the ſame plea. If the one plead his labour, and danger in going out in purſuit of it; the other may plead, his equal labour and danger in both theſe circumſtances. If the one, plead his RIGHT to it, from KILLING it; the other may with juſt as much reaſon, claim it on the plea, of his VICTORY, in TAKING it from him. For, if, he who killed it, urge as a plea, that it is his PROPERTY, becauſe he killed it; then, this aſſertion is either abſurd, or muſt imply ſome CONVENTION; and conſequently, ſome SPECIES of GOVERNMENT amongſt certain perſons; who, have *agreed* to ſuffer every one to enjoy *unmoleſted*, the prey, which *he* himſelf has *killed*. For without ſuch a *convention*, NO PROPERTY can poſſibly exiſt; and conſequently

quently therefore NO RIGHT, previous to ſome league or covenant between men, which ſome have agreed to adhere to, and to ſupport, by ſome *common* FORCE, againſt *any* infringement;—which union conſtitutes a ſpecies of *government*. From nature then, men may have POSSESSIONS; but it is from GOVERNMENT alone, they can derive their CLAIM to them,—as RIGHTS.

I too well know already, and I fear I ſhall experience it yet more fully, how extremely difficult, it is ſo far to *overcome* men's PREPOSSESSIONS, much more, to conquer their PREJUDICES, ſo as to make them, *accurately*, and *clearly* to diſcern, the GROUNDS and PRINCIPLES of this reaſoning; becauſe, from infancy they learn, to conceive the *practices*, and *principles*, which are moſt *common* in a ſtate of government, and ſociety, to have univerſally exiſted, *previous* to that ſtate. Few, very few, being diſpoſed to give themſelves

ſelves the trouble of labouring up to the ſources of *that* NILE, from which, ſuch rules and practiſes ſpring. Though even, a poet, I mean, Horace, in his *third ſatire*, might with the aid of a little of their own reflection, have taught them better. The paſſage begins, "quum prorepſerunt primis "animalia terris." The whole is too long to tranſcribe, and I ſhall therefore refer you for the remainder, either to the book, or to your own memory.

From theſe premiſes, then, it neceſſarily follows; that *before*, we can with any PROPRIETY, TALK of RIGHTS, we muſt firſt ſuppoſe, ſome CLEAR and DEFINITE RULE of action; by ſome means, or other, to EXIST. For, we can no more ſay, that *any* act is RIGHT, or WRONG, without the exiſtence of a RULE of CONDUCT, with which we can COMPARE it; than we can ſay, a thing is STRAIT or CROOKED, without MEASURING it, by ſome LINE, either

either ſenſible, or imaginary. But in a MERE STATE of NATURE, who has authority to lay down a rule; by an adherence to which, or aberration from it, MEN's ACTIONS are to be denominated, either RIGHT, or WRONG? The mere ſuppoſition of the exiſtence of ſuch an authority; is totally irreconcileable with, contradictory, and oppoſite to the very ideas, which are comprehended, under the words,—"A STATE "OF NATURE."

For, where, ſuch an *authority* is; there likewiſe *ſome government* is; and, if, this authority be in a ſingle man, whether it be veſted in him by others, or uſurped by himſelf, HE is a MONARCH. If it be maintained, that though there may be no AUTHORITY, to command obedience to them, yet, SUCH RULES may be eſtabliſhed by MUTUAL AGREEMENT. We may anſwer, what does it avail, to lay down a rule, or rules of conduct, which, no man, is

COMPELLABLE TO OBEY; becauſe, no man has power to enforce them. For, if you go on further, and ſuppoſe; that they may, by a mutual compact, *determine* to PUNISH any, who tranſgreſs the rules, to which they have agreed; you once more return to a ſuppoſition, abſolutely repugnant, to the very idea of a *ſtate of nature*; as this, likewiſe ſuppoſes a *government* to *exiſt*; the ſpecies of which, is wholly popular, or in ſome meaſure, partaking of the republican, oligarchical, or ariſtocratical forms.

What therefore, in a STATE OF NATURE, can poſſibly give the impulſe to men's actions, (the *lawful authority* of the parent, and *accidental compulſion* of another excepted) but the FIRST PRINCIPLES of our nature; our *inſtincts*, *appetites*, *deſires*, *paſſions*; and the *concluſions* of our *reaſon*, as to the *choice*, of the reſpective indulgence of them, in any particular caſe? For the

ſake

ſake of the RECTITUDE, of what RULE, then, can men by any MOTIVE be induced, to FOREGO, their own indulgence in any deſire they can gratify; though they ſhould even take from another, an object of gratification; which had been ever ſo long in his poſſeſſion?

If ſuch, be the *natural*, and *equal* freedom of all mankind; it is abſurd, to talk of *rights*, in ſuch a ſtate; becauſe, it is only a ſtate of *licence*, to every man, to do hurt to every man, where, his *power* can ſecond his *inclination*.

But, you Sir, and ſome others, will perhaps readily ſay, that the queſtion I have aſked, in the foregoing paragraph, is ſurely very eaſily reſolved: even, without the neceſſity of ſuppoſing the exiſtence of ANY RULE, to direct men, but merely, by that very FACULTY of REASON; which I do not deny, but even have admitted to exiſt, in ſuch a ſtate.

I am ſorry however, to ſay, that ſuch an anſwer, would betray a total ignorance, of the *meaning* of the PRINCIPAL TERM, which it contains. For, one would think, as it is here employed, and as indeed, we hear, and ſee numbers, every day, applying it; that REASON was a *weapon* beſtowed upon us, by which, we can, at any time ſubdue the inſtincts, deſires, inclinations, and paſſions of our nature; like a club, in the hand of a ſavage; by which, he may knock down, the beaſts of the foreſt. Whereas in truth, the POWER of REASON, as it relates to our conduct, is nothing elſe, but that FACULTY, with which, nature has endowed us, to COMPARE the ſeveral modes of pleaſure, and pain, with each other, which inſtigate us to action; and, ſo to enable us, to diſcern, from memory of our paſt experience, which mode in every inſtance, ſurpaſſes the reſt; or how each of which, exceeds the other, in DURATION, and INTENSITY, COMBINED.

NED. When, we make this *compariſon*, then, we are ſaid to *reaſon;* and, if we chooſe, the acquiſition of that pleaſure, or the avoidance of that pain, which upon ſuch an eſtimate, is, the *greateſt;* we are ſaid to have made a *rational* choice; or, to *act rationally*. But, whilſt men then, have only their inſtincts, appetites, and paſſions, to urge them on to action; when no *moral ſcience* exiſts; when no *law*, nor *rule of action* is inſtituted, for the direction of man's conduct;—REASON is of *no uſe* to man, but, to enable him, to *chooſe* out of thoſe *inſtincts*, *appetites*, and *paſſions*, *that*, to which in any particular caſe, he ſhould give the preference to follow; REASON being furniſhed (in the caſe ſuppoſed) only with the objects of thoſe inſtincts, &c. out of which, it can direct the will to chooſe.

Thus for inſtance, a man may indeed, be ſometimes reſtrained, from forcibly ſeiz-

ing

ing ſomething in the poſſeſſion of another, by *dread* of the ſuperior ſtrength of the individual, at the moment of an open attack; or deterred, from privately taking it away, by *fear* of a ſpeedy or a lingering REVENGE. For, a STATE OF NATURE, is only a CONTINUED ſcene of CONTENTION, from OPPOSING PASSIONS.

But then, though he may certainly here, very properly be ſaid to *reaſon;* yet, what *conſtitutes* his *reaſoning*, but, the making a *compariſon* between the deſired good, and the apprehended evil? And, what reſults from his reaſoning in this caſe, or is the concluſion of reaſon, in reſpect to his conduct in this particular inſtance? Nothing but this,—that the action is better avoided, —becauſe, the probability of his incurring pain by ſuch an action, is greater, than the probability of the acquiſition of pleaſure: or, that the *riſk* of ſuffering the one, is a greater evil, than the *chance* of enjoying the other, is a good.

Will

Will you then, Sir, who are not only the diſciple of Mr. Locke upon government, but have profeſſed to receive HIS OPINIONS as AXIOMS, maintain the EXISTENCE of certain "INNATE MORAL PRACTICAL PRINCIPLES?" You may perhaps, advance ſo far, in defence of that ſuppoſition, and certainly with as much *conſiſtency* as Mr. Locke has gone, as to ſay,—*becauſe*, HE has ſaid it;—"that NO "MAN, has a RIGHT over the LIFE or "LIBERTY of another, or to hurt him in "*any* reſpect whatſoever, unleſs, that *other*, "has *done* SOME HURT to him."

Theſe words, to be ſure in themſelves, are no *bad ſounding words;* but WHAT is their MEANING? Unleſs you can ſhow, that the *man himſelf*, has a RIGHT to his LIFE and LIBERTY in a ſtate, where, NO LAWS for GOVERNING our PASSIONS exiſt? For otherwiſe, they contain only this *identical* propoſition; that the *one* man has certainly

certainly NO RIGHT to take them away, becauſe,—NO RIGHT of ANY KIND WHATSOEVER, EXISTS. But it is as certain, therefore, that the other upon this ground, can PLEAD NO RIGHT to KEEP them, and conſequently, that though the other, inflicts pain, he does NO WRONG IN TAKING THEM AWAY.

But, even to make out the PROOF of this RIGHT, on the one part, and the WRONG on the other, you perhaps may think to be a moſt eaſy taſk. For, ſo early, was ſuch a notion, inſtilled into us at firſt, and ſo continually has it been inculcated into us ever ſince, that I doubt not, but many, who do not deem it to be an innate notion, think it to be a ſelf-evident propoſition. You will probably therefore, think it ſufficient to ſay, that a man's LIFE and LIBERTY are HIS RIGHTS,—becauſe they are HIS;—they are HIS OWN;—they are HIS PROPERTY;—he is in POSSESSION

SESSION of them;—they can not be TAKEN from him WITHOUT FORCE;—becauſe, NATURE has GIVEN them to him, and a thouſand ſuch expreſſions, with which we find the advocates for the *natural rights* of men adorned; ſtrung together like the beaded ornaments of ſavages, which, like them too, have only an accidental junction, but no natural coherence.

For, Sir, the queſtion ſtill returns, where, is the *intermediate propoſition*, or definition, which makes RIGHT and POSSESSION in this caſe, ſynonimous terms. NATURE has given trees, and ſtones, poſſeſſion, of ſome part of the ground; but is a man guilty of any violation of the RIGHTS of thoſe objects, when he *cuts down a tree, or, forces a ſtone to aſcend, contrary to it's nature, into the air.*

But theſe, perhaps you will ſay, are caſes totally diſſimilar, becauſe there is NO

PAIN produced, in depriving the latter, of what nature gave them; as there is in the former caſe ſuppoſed. True Sir. Why ſuppoſe then, that a man in a ſtate of nature, ſees an horſe, or a deer, or both, running wild; and by ſome ſtratagem he catches them: he certainly immediately deprives them both of their liberty. Suppoſe then further, that he keeps the one as his ſlave, —to lighten his own labour, or,—to give him pleaſure; and that he kills the other for food,—to gratify his appetite of hunger. Will you be ſo good, as to tell me, whether he does wrong? If, you, and I can be once convinced, that he does,—I am ſure, that neither of us, ſhall, ever again taſte any meat, nor ever more mount on horſeback, whatever mortification, from the abſtinence, we might ſuſtain. Now, Sir, in this caſe, there *is* PAIN produced, as well as in the caſe before ſuppoſed; and the horſe's, and deer's *lives*, and *liberties*,—were as much *theirs*,—as much *their own*,—as much *their proper-*

ty

ty,—they were as much in *poſſeſſion* of them,—they had them as much from *nature*, as the man had his. If then, for *theſe* reaſons,—life and liberty were the MAN'S NATURAL RIGHTS,—why are they not equally the NATURAL RIGHTS of the horſe and the deer,—the wolf and the lamb, the fox and the chicken, the dog and the cat; and why is it therefore not as WRONG, to kill even a MOUSE,—as a MAN? Be ſo good, as to *forget* for a moment, that you ever read the BOOK of GENESIS, and then ſhow me, by what *ſingle* principle, or *concatenation* of propoſitions, it follows, that a MAN has a RIGHT to every thing, which nature gave,—of which the deprivation, would give him pain.—I muſt once more tell you,—that I mean, PRIOR to *every inſtitution* of *laws*, and *government*.

For a man to ſay, that as I ſhould feel pain myſelf in ſuch a caſe, therefore,

I will not inflict the pain upon another, but will rather ſuffer the pain, or inconvenience, I ſhall myſelf ſuſtain, from not gratifying my deſire, to take away his life and liberty;—would be very excellently humane, and benevolent reaſoning, and would apply to all beings, endowed with *ſenſation*. But this proves not the RIGHT of the ANIMAL, or of the ONE MAN, but only the FORBEARANCE of the OTHER.

Again, ſuppoſe he ſhould ſay, that I am ſo conſtituted by nature, that I can not give pain to another ſenſitive being, without the rebound of ſome pain upon myſelf;—therefore I will not be the cauſe of pain to others? This would certainly evince in him, great ſympathy and compaſſion. But his conduct then would not be founded, upon any ſenſe of the RIGHTS of OTHERS, but upon SELF-LOVE, ariſing from the conſideration of his own ſuſceptibility to pain, under ſuch particular circumſtances.

ces. But ſuppoſe, his deſire of ſome gratification, which he would enjoy, in conſequence of his depriving another of his life and liberty, *fully* to *overbalance* that pain, which is the offspring of compaſſion, what would then remain, to *reſtrain* him?

And as I am at preſent, in the interrogatory humour of Socrates, I muſt beg leave to aſk further, WHAT CONSTITUTES it MORE the RIGHT of ONE man, to enjoy the pleaſures, reſulting from the LIFE and LIBERTY, which nature gave him, than of the OTHER, to enjoy the PLEASURE, which reſults from the gratification of his DESIRES; which, nature likewiſe gave him? The queſtion therefore, ſtill remains unanſwered. And indeed, could IT be *ſatisfactorily* anſwered, this is only a *leading* queſtion, to *that*,—which is the preciſe one in the inſtance, I have ſuppoſed, and quoted from Mr. Locke. For in *that*, the SAME MAN is in *two different caſes*, in poſſeſſion of

of his *life* and *liberty*. In the one of which, the man is conceived to have ſuffered *no hurt* from the other; in the other caſe, he is ſuppoſed, to *have received one*. The real queſtion therefore is, and I beg you will particularly obſerve it, WHAT CONSTITUTES HIS RIGHT TO KEEP his life and liberty, where he has done the other NO HURT; and what CONSTITUTES the RIGHT of the *other*, to TAKE THEM AWAY, where, he has?

For my own part, Sir, I have thought long and much upon it; and can find no leading idea, no ſeparating, nor connecting principle in the two caſes. And as I am not prone, to *take* a propoſition *for granted*, becauſe, another man, whatever may be his reputation, affirms it; I muſt beg, as the condition, of my aſſent, even to a propoſition of Mr. Locke's, neither his, nor your WORDS; but either your's, or ſome other perſon's bond of

PROOF.

PROOF. I can however assure you, that in vain will you search for one, in the works of *Grotius*, *Puffendorf*, *Barbeyrac*, *Burlamaqui*, or, of any later writer upon government.

In vain likewise, will you, or even any society in this kingdom, however large in numbers, or dignified in rank and abilities, address the NATIONAL ASSEMBLY of *France* for instruction, upon this most fundamental point. They, having already published, in their *declaration of rights*,—all they know, upon this subject; and which has with high encomiums, been more than once most sedulously disseminated, throughout the kingdom. To those indeed, who love to walk in a mist, because, the vapours, by confounding the outlines of things, serve to magnify the objects; *their declaration* must be most highly, and most gratefully acceptable. For do but attend once more, Sir, to what I do not doubt, you have often before

before read; I mean *this declaration of rights*, which we are informed, holds out to the world, "*inſtruction, of great conſequence to* "*civil government*, and *founded upon* GREAT "AUTHORITY, being agreed to by the NA- "TIONAL ASSEMBLY of *France*, and *ſanc-* "*tioned* by the KING." I will only detain you, by tranſcribing, TWO of theſe "*ſimple* "*and inconteſtible principles*," as they have been called, and making a ſhort comment upon them, they having the moſt intimate connection with the queſtion, now before us, and beſides having had the high honour, of being *ſelected*, to form a *baſis*, for the reſt.

"Men were BORN, and ALWAYS CON- "TINUE FREE, and EQUAL, in reſpect of "their RIGHTS: civil diſtinction THERE- "FORE," *(which muſt render men unfree*, and *unequal)* "can be founded only on "PUBLIC UTILITY," *(which is to ſay there-fore in other words, that theſe natural rights of*

of men, are incompatible with PUBLIC UTILITY.)

"The end of all POLITICAL aſſociations, "IS the PRESERVATION of the NATURAL "and IMPRESCRIPTIBLE RIGHTS of man;" *(which therefore according to the foregoing declaration, civil diſtinctions, for the ſake of* PUBLIC UTILITY, *take away)* and thoſe RIGHTS, are LIBERTY, PROPERTY, SECURITY, and RESISTANCE of OPPRESSION. *But all theſe impreſcriptible rights as they are called, the very inſtitution of government, and of laws, is intended to* PRESCRIBE.

OH LEPIDUM CAPUT!

That the end, of all *political aſſociations*, is to preſerve to men, liberty, property, ſecurity, and reſiſtance of oppreſſion, to a *certain degree*, and not to deſtroy them, as the *national aſſembly* has done,—is indeed true; and will be preſently proved. But, this is,—by CONSTITUTING them to BE

the RIGHTS of men, under a ſtate of *government*, which, were NOT RIGHTS, in a *ſtate of nature*.

Theſe ſelf-taught legiſlators therefore you ſee, hold not out to you, the leaſt aſſiſtance towards the ſolution of this almoſt *Sphinxian Ænigma*, with which you are puzzled. For the *national aſſembly*, *you* find, an aſſembly of *philoſophers*, undoubtedly as they are, have certainly adopted the eaſieſt, though not that, which either Plato, or Ariſtotle would have thought the *beſt* mode of inſtruction,—the taking,—I mean, a propoſition for granted,—inſtead of proving it.

Yet, ſo licentious are our public prints become, as to maintain, for I lately myſelf read the aſſertion in the news-papers, that the *framer* of this *luminous* DECLARATION, OF RIGHTS, is *undoubtedly* the WISEST MAN in FRANCE. Ought not ſuch calumniators to be puniſhed, for publiſhing

ſo

ſo ſcandalous a LIBEL on the UNDERSTANDINGS, of THE WHOLE FRENCH NATION.

Having now ſpun out the thread of this epiſtle, as I truſt, to a reaſonable length, and having propoſed to you, a ſubject beſt fitted for the retirement of your ſtudy, and the ſilence of meditation; it will I apprehend, be moſt proper, here to conclude this letter. For, would but the generality of authors, change their hours allotted to reading and to thinking, into the *inverſe ratio* of that, which they moſt commonly bear to each other; the world would ſoon be delivered from thoſe great evils,—great books. And ſtudents then, at once receiving the precious ore, pure and defecated, would no longer either ſweat under the fatigue of clearing away the droſs, or be covered, or choked with it's duſt.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

LETTER IV.

SIR,

THOUGH I have often maintained, and muſt always think, that how much ſoever a man may BELIEVE, he can never poſſibly KNOW any thing, of which, he has NEVER DOUBTED; yet as I am alſo perſuaded, that a conſtant ſtate of *ſcepticiſm*, is the worſt of all the chronic maladies, which can afflict the human mind; I am now eager to offer myſelf as your phyſician, to deliver you from that irkſome ſtate, in which I left you, at the concluſion of my laſt letter. For, though ſome portion, or potion, of ſcepticiſm, is ſometimes as neceſſary to keep the mind in a conſtant habit

habit of health and vigour, as a cathartic is ſometimes beneficial to the body; yet, ſcepticiſm, which is, as it were, a mental diarrhœa, muſt like the bodily one, infallibly end in debility, and diſſolution. I hope however, this alluſion will not give offence, either to your delicacy, or to the nice olfactory ſenſes of others, in this refined age. Becauſe, I muſt confeſs, that 'till a new art of criticiſm be written, I cannot diſcover, either high or low, why mean alluſions are not as properly ſuited to low things; as the *loftieſt* ſimilitudes, are to the higheſt ſubjects.

Now Sir, though I can not poſſibly attempt to ſhow you, why LIFE and LIBERTY are more the NATURAL RIGHTS of MEN, than of HORSES, and where that intermediate *idea* exiſts, which makes them ſo, after which, we have been ſo long enquiring, but have never found; yet I can very eaſily find, and inform you of the

the miſtake, which led Mr. Locke into this maze of error. A diſcovery, certainly next in it's importance, to the diſcovery of the object itſelf. Becauſe it will ſave mankind in future, from the fruitleſs labour, of darkly and ignorantly hunting round and round, in ſearch of an object, which has no exiſtence; and the diſpute, upon NATURAL RIGHTS, will no longer oſcillate, upon a mere fluctuating argument ad ignorantiam; but, will be fixed for ever, upon the immoveable point of real ſcience.

That *ſome* men in a *ſtate* of *nature*, WOULD indeed take away another's life and liberty, in ONE of the caſes ſuppoſed by Mr. Locke, who would *not* do it in the other; is a clear and indiſputable fact. But, that they would do this, without either knowing or thinking about NATURAL RIGHTS, is infinitely more evident, than any of his *axioms*, to which you ſo readily

ly give your aſſent, and, which you deem it criminal in others, to doubt.

For the NATURE of MAN is SO CONSTITUTED, that the paſſions of ANGER, HATRED, and REVENGE, naturally ſpring up in him, upon any attempt of another, either to inflict upon him any pain, or to deprive him of any pleaſure, is likewiſe certain beyond contradiction. But, if THESE be the MOTIVES of HIS action, in the caſe ſuppoſed, who has really SUFFERED PAIN from another; then, he NO MORE deprives that other of his LIFE and LIBERTY, from a SENSE of RIGHT, than the OTHER, inflicted the PRIOR PAIN upon THAT PRINCIPLE;—BOTH acting EQUALLY from their paſſions or appetites. The one perhaps, to acquire a pleaſure not before poſſeſſed, the other to gratify revenge for a loſs ſuſtained.

No doubt, wiſe, is the proviſion of nature, by which we are furniſhed with ſuch

a

a paſſion, as REVENGE, though the exerciſe of it, often brings great evils upon mankind. But, equally wiſe likewiſe, is that proviſion, of nature, which furniſhes us with other PASSIONS and DESIRES; which produce alſo many evils, by urging men to wiſh for, and to attempt to take away the poſſeſſions of others. But, so FAR are the PASSIONS THEMSELVES, or even the *reſpective* STRENGTH of *different* paſſions, FROM CONSTITUTING a RIGHT to THAT, which they prompt us to deſire, that in order for the very BIRTH and ESTABLISHMENT of RIGHTS; RULES or LAWS, are made to SUBDUE the ONE, and to CONSTITUTE the other, which laws, are not the offspring of PASSION, but of REASON. And the PRINCIPLE which furniſhes men with the power of reaſoning upon this point, and drawing out deductions, is the CONCLUSION, which experience has taught them, from the endurance of paſt evils, of the utility, and even NECESSITY there is, for the

the inſtitution of a government, and the eſtabliſhment of laws, ſo as to conſtitute it, the RIGHT of a GOVERNOR, to PUNISH any one, who HURTS another; in order to PREVENT the actual EXERCISE of that VERY PASSION, by which, *Mr. Locke* ſays, every man has a RIGHT to PUNISH another, and in conſequence of which, the life of man had been, but one continued ſcene of reciprocal infliction, and ſuffering of wounds, pain, and death.

In a country indeed, where, the WILL of GOD had been made known to the inhabitants, directly by REVELATION, or where, by a revelation to one nation, ſome knowledge of it had been transfuſed to another by *tradition*, not only of the exiſtence of a God, and ſome religious worſhip or other,—which moſt countries have;—but likewiſe, of HIS WILL, with regard to MEN'S CONDUCT to EACH OTHER, —of which, all people in a STATE OF

NATURE, muſt have been always ignorant, without the ineſtimable benefit, either of ſuch a revelation, or ſuch a tradition,—THEY might indeed have CONCEIVED and TALKED of RIGHTS, and had a groundwork, upon which, they might have pleaded them. But, if inſtead of imagining caſes, which never exiſted, but in ſome few particular inſtances, we have recourſe to true hiſtory, and real fact,—we ſhall learn,—that the FIRST RIGHTS known to men, are thoſe, which had their origin, from *ſome ſpecies* of GOVERNMENT, however imperfect it might be; and it follows therefore as a conſequence, that *government* is *not* founded upon PRIOR RIGHTS; but that IT only, actually by LAWS, delivered either orally, or in writing, CONVERTS THOSE POSSESSIONS INTO PROPERTY, and INTO RIGHTS; which, had before no OTHER TENURE, than that uncertain and precarious one, which was at all times, ſubject to DISSOLUTION from the LUSTS, APPETITES,

APPETITES, STRENGTH, VIOLENCE, and FORCE of OTHERS.

Harraſſed and fatigued, with ſo miſerable a ſtate of exiſtence, as this, OF NATURE, eſpecially, when men having forſaken the hunting and fiſhing ſtates, were brought into a nearer intercourſe with each other, by paſtoral, and agricultural occupations, they reſolved to terminate it, by ſearching out ſome remedy, againſt the continuance of theſe evils. This they effected, *firſt*, perhaps by providing a ſecurity againſt the external violence, they ſuſtained from other men, whoſe huts, or habitations, were at ſome diſtance from them; and who would frequently by ſurpriſe, in one night, extirpate, or enſlave, almoſt all the inhabitants of a wide extended diſtrict. *Secondly*, likewiſe, to guard themſelves from the equally bad conſequences, which aroſe from the more frequent evils, produced by the unreſtrained

exercise of the passions, of those, who lived in a closer vicinity with each other. From these slight sketches, the first rude frame of a government was formed. Some by choice determining, and others, by necessity being compelled, to submit to the government, or controul, of some one man to direct them; who was either selected by others, or who having from some cause or other, acquired such authority amongst them, that they quietly submitted to his assumption of the rule, and command over them.

From these PREMISES, then, it NECESSARILY FOLLOWS, that the office of the governor, was, by uniting them in a body, to lead them out to war, to repel the attacks of distant enemies; and by laying down laws, for the regulation of their conduct, and by the power of punishment, intrusted in his hands,—to deter all the members of the several families, which by their

their union, formed the ſtate, from interrupting each other, in the USE and PEACEABLE ENJOYMENT, of their RESPECTIVE ACQUISITIONS, except in ſuch caſes, as the governor thought neceſſary for the public good.

Such were the views, without doubt, with which men aſſociated together, and ſuch were the ends, which they propoſed.

They, certainly did NOT unite into ſociety, and form a government, for the purpoſe of ACTING WITHOUT RESTRAINT, according to the *volitions*, and *determinations* of their own *paſſions*, *inclinations*, *caprice*, or *fancy*, or even the CONCLUSIONS, OF EACH MAN'S SEPARATE REASON. For on the contrary, the very purpoſe of their aſſociating together, was to ESCAPE FROM THE EVILS OF SUCH A STATE, where, ALL WERE MISERABLE, FROM EACH MAN'S ACTING ACCORDING TO HIS OWN WILL, WITHOUT

WITHOUT THE CURB OF SOME COMMON CONTROUL. But, they united into ſociety, and formed a GOVERNMENT, by giving authority TO ONE MAN, to PREVENT the EXERCISE OF SUCH FREE-WILL, and to PROVIDE SUCH A CONTROUL; by COMPELLING THEM to SUBMIT to ſuch GENERAL LAWS, as HIS REASON ſhould deviſe, and HIS POWER ſhould enforce.

From the foregoing reaſoning, then the CONCLUSION is EVIDENT;—that if any ONE, or any NUMBER of individuals, ſet up (in ſuch government as that, whoſe formation I have been deſcribing) HIS, or THEIR wills, in OPPOSITION to the WILL of the LEGISLATOR, HE or THEY are GUILTY of the GREATEST of ALL crimes, they can poſſibly commit. Becauſe, it is a crime, which diſſolves at once, the whole cement of ſociety, and ſnaps aſunder by violence, all the bonds of government, which tend to ſecure to the WHOLE,—

PEACE

PEACE and TRANQUILITY. For OPPOSITION to the WILL of the LEGISLATOR, tends to drive them back, to that MISERABLE STATE OF NATURE, from which, they gladly fled to GOVERNMENT, as to a REFUGE and an ASYLUM. And hence it was, that *Socrates*, who was eſteemed in Greece, as the wiſeſt of the ſons of men, however he may be now *deſpiſed* by the *philoſophers* of modern days, ſubmitted *chearfully* to die, in obedience to the laws, of a *tyrannic republic*, as ſuch there may be, however ſtrange, ſuch a notion may appear to modern politicians. For notwithſtanding *he* was unjuſtly condemned by his judges, he was nobly inflexible to all the entreaties, and great and generous pains, taken by his friends, to perſuade him to eſcape. To the honour of *Athens* however, it ought ever to be remembered, that ſoon after his death, the citizens were ſincerely ſorry, and truly penitent, for the injuſtice and cruelty, with which they had treated him; having been

ſeduced

ſeduced by the flimſy, but cruel miſre-preſentations of a comic wit,—the mean envy, or ſtill meaner ſelf-intereſt of eloquent ſophiſts.—The contagious corruption of a turbulent faction,—and the furious phrenzy of a popular aſſembly.

It was then, from the *inſtitution* of a *government*, that there *firſt* aroſe in thoſe, who had not the WILL of GOD revealed to them,—IDEAS of RIGHTS and WRONGS, of OBLIGATION and DUTY, of MERIT and DEMERIT, between men in *general*, who were not bound to each other, by the ligaments of nature. By thoſe *ligaments* I mean, the *inſtincts*, and *affections* of the mind, which reciprocally bind parents to children,—huſbands to wives,—brothers to ſiſters,—friends to friends,—and in general,—the perſon obliged to his benefactor. Theſe AFFECTIONS indeed, muſt in SOME DEGREE, ALWAYS exiſt in every ſtate of human nature; whether they be, or be not under

any

any government; though, *even theſe feelings*, are very *faint* and *imperfect*, 'till the bridle by which government curbs our hoſtile deſires, has ſubdued and broken the other unruly paſſions of our nature, taught men to move in certain regular and ſettled paces, and thus given an opportunity to the gentler and ſofter inclinations, to form themſelves by HABIT,—INTO AFFECTIONS; which, were at firſt, —only EMOTIONS.

For it is ſurely very evident, that till ſome rules of action, in the manner I have ſtated, were preſcribed,—there could be no MEASURE of the RECTITUDE, or DEVIATION of men's actions. For there could be no RIGHT in one man to ANY POSSESSION,—'till ſome *rule* had conſtituted it ſo, by forbidding and preventing others, from giving him any moleſtation in the enjoyment of it. There could be NO DUTIES, (except the reciprocal ones I have

before mentioned) 'till there was SOME OBLIGATION;—and there could be,—NO OBLIGATION, 'till,—there was SOME ONE, who had a POWER by ſome motive, to OBLIGE another to do an act; and 'till there was another,—who was OBLIGED by that motive,—to OBEY. Men could be entitled to NO MERIT, nor DEMERIT from their conduct, 'till,—there was ſome LAW, in conſequence of which, they were by a NON-COMPLIANCE, with it, ENTITLED to BLAME, or ſome OTHER PUNISHMENT; or which, by holding out REWARDS, as the conſequence of a CONFORMITY with it, ENTITLED them to, or made them MERIT, or DESERVE praiſe, or ſome other reward. Yet evident as ſuch a concluſion, muſt be to every mind, habituated to deep thought; what admired ſyſtems, of what is called, PHILOSOPHY have we ſeen, which place the exiſtence of the ideas annexed to theſe words, for want of an accurate analyſis of their meaning, anterior,

terior, though certainly they are ſubſequent to the formation of all laws, rules of actions, rewards, and puniſhments. And thus it happens, that many a fair, ſplendid, and beautiful ſyſtem, when the meaning of the words, which form the fundamental propoſition of the whole fabric, are ſo examined as to be clearly aſcertained, tumble into pieces, and leaves it's fragments, as ſome memorial of it's author's genius, but, at the ſame time, of his fruitleſs labour, and his miſapplied application.

THESE are the PRINCIPLES then, from which originates the RIGHT of the GOVERNOR to COMMAND; and, alſo the DUTY of the GOVERNED to OBEY. To the former, in the caſe I have juſt ſtated, as their LEGISLATOR, they have entruſted, not only the POWER, but the RIGHT of JUDGING for them, what actions each man is to perform, ſo as to act conſiſtently with the GENERAL GOOD of the whole.

And this too without any contract,—direct or implied,—any ſtipulation,—or condition of any RESISTANCE whatſoever, in any caſe whatſoever, when any number, few or many, the minority, or majority, ſhould happen to think differently from the legiſlator, and not deem a law conducive to private, or public good. A truſt which however LIABLE TO ABUSE, aroſe, from men's experience of the evils, which they ſuſtained, whilſt EACH individual acted according to the PRIVATE determination of his OWN WILL.

If therefore, the ſubjects attempt, by FORCE to defend themſelves, from ſubmiſſion to the governor's authority, they certainly can not plead any RIGHT to do it, but are JUSTLY ſaid,—to REBEL,—or to MAKE WAR again; and the governor, has conſequently a RIGHT to SUBDUE them by a ſuperior force, for invading HIS RIGHT, and every OTHER MAN'S RIGHT, as a member of the ſociety.

For

For such a resistance, is an attempt to DISSOLVE and ANNIHILATE the GOVERNMENT itself; and to involve their fellow subjects once more, in all the ANARCHY, MISERY and CONFUSION, which attend upon A STATE OF NATURE. An attempt, which not only constitutes a FOLLY of the greatest magnitude; but a CRIME likewise of the deepest dye. For, *that* one act of criminality, which tends to pluck up the whole happiness, and existence of the society by the roots, must necessarily IMPLICATE in it's PERPETRATION, the UNITED FLAGITIOUSNESS of EVERY OTHER CRIME.

If, the truth of these premises be denied, and I well know, that, on account of men's *prepossessions*, and *prejudices*, they will with the utmost difficulty be admitted; let *such*, however reflect a moment upon the absurdity, in which, they necessarily involve themselves. For from the denial

of

of theſe principles, it will follow, that NO INSTITUTION of GOVERNMENT can POSSIBLY SUBSIST. As the *very* DEFINITION of the WORD, "GOVERNMENT," IMPLIES, and conſequently, the very ESSENCE of the THING, MUST CONSIST, in the PEOPLE'S SUBMISSION, to the authority of ONE or MORE PERSONS; as it's DIFFERENT FORMS, may happen to VARY. Which is the ſame as to ſay, in other words,—that ALL the other members of the community, are BOUND to SUBMIT to HIS or THEIR JUDGMENT, as to what general laws are to be made, to direct each individual, what actions he is to perform, for the GOOD of the SOCIETY.

If then, the legiſlature, *ſhould enact* ſuch laws, as any number of them, even MUCH MORE than the MAJORITY, may in their own opinion, think have a direct contrary tendency; they can have no RIGHT, nor LEGAL means of oppoſing them, except

cept it may be by an humble repreſentation, of their own opinions. But, if the laws be not repealed in conſequence of ſuch a petition, nothing is left to the petitioners, but either quietly to acquieſce, in the determination of the legiſlature, or to withdraw themſelves from that ſtate, and put themſelves under the protection of another. For they, can not poſſibly ſet forth any RIGHT whatſoever, on which, they can build any CLAIM to OPPOSE the laws by FORCE; becauſe, SUCH a CLAIM would be a DEMOLITION *of the* WHOLE COMPACT of ſociety; which is,—that the ſubjects agreed to SUBMIT to the will and JUDGMENT of the LEGISLATURE; NOT, —that the GOVERNOR'S and LEGISLATOR'S will, ſhould ſubmit to THEIRS.

As theſe principles, Sir, however manifeſtly true, or evidently beautiful they may be, in themſelves, or however good, and wholeſome may be their fruits, (for according

cording to the *platonic philoſophy*, TRUTH, BEAUTY, and GOOD, are ONE) yet, as I am afraid, that they will notwithſtanding, ſeem very *unpalatable* to you, I ſhall by terminating this letter, once more leave you time, to chew upon them the cud of reflection.

I need not, I dare to ſay, to aſſure you, that they will never be *clearly comprehended* by any one; 'till he has learned ACCURATELY to diſtinguiſh, between the *true* and *vulgar* application of WORDS to THINGS; and is able to place the IDEAS DIVESTED of THE WORDS, in their natural ſhapes, colours and dimenſions, before the *orbit*, and *pupil* of his INTELLECT.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

LETTER

LETTER V.

SIR,

I Have now, given you an opportunity of taking what time you pleaſe, for concocting the FIRST PRINCIPLES OF ALL GOVERNMENT; if, *ſatiety* occaſioned by the diſhes, which *Mr. Locke* had ſerved up upon this occaſion, has not excited in you, ſuch an antipathy, as to produce an averſion even to *their* taſte.

Theſe principles, are certainly not faſhionable; and therefore not being popular, can not at preſent, be of any uſe to any

 artiſt,

artiſt, in *book-making;* except, by the opportunity they afford of manufacturing ſome wares for ſale, in *oppoſition* to them. For when once an age is enlightened by the ſplendor of book-making, and has imbibed it's genuine ſpirit; the merit of a work muſt always be eſtimated, according to the valuation of Hudibras, who aſks,

For what is worth in any thing?

then anſwers,

But ſo much money as 'twill bring.

But whether YOU will with all the pertinacity of bigotry, reſolve to adhere to whatever *Mr. Locke* has *told*,—for he certainly has not *taught* it, you; either by a refuſal of further examination, and a maintenance of it againſt conviction; or, will begin to think with Socrates, that there is no ſeaſon of a man's life, too late for the acquiſition of freſh knowledge, by exploring and ſearching after truth, to whatever diſtance, the inveſtigation may lead;—is yours to chooſe,

chooſe, not mine to dictate. But, if you be diſpoſed to make ſuch an enquiry, that nothing may be omitted by me, which may at all tend to facilitate your progreſs:—I ſhall beg leave, now, to remove TWO OBJECTIONS;—which might perhaps otherwiſe, not only obſtruct you in your road, but even, perhaps, prevent your acquiſition, of the object of your purſuit.

For, you may poſſibly imagine, in the FIRST place,—that, what I have aſſigned, as the VERY FIRST principles of ALL GOVERNMENT, can at moſt, be only the SECONDARY propoſitions, founded upon *ſome*, which were either *prior* to them in exiſtence; or which, though poſterior, as to diſcovery,—either ſuperſede them by their importance, or deſtroy them by their contrariety.

SECONDLY, you may perhaps conceive, that however clear, and evident, the truth of

thoſe PRINCIPLES, which I have advanced, appear to be; yet, they muſt neceſſarily be limited in their extent, to a *certain degree*. For you will probably urge, that if we trace out the concluſions, which *unavoidably* follow from them,—it is neceſſary,—that we ſhould *reject* the *principles*, in their *utmoſt latitude;* from fear, of the danger, which would reſult from their CONSEQUENCES. As you will perhaps, under this *ſecond head*, aſſert, that upon theſe principles,—OBEDIENCE, is as much due to the WORST, as to the BEST government in the world,—which, YOU will *deem* to be abſurd: and that the cruelleſt acts, of the moſt DESPOTIC TYRANT, are to be by them JUSTIFIED, upon the ground of RIGHT;—which you will juſtly condemn as IMMORAL.

As to the FORMER OBJECTION, it is certainly founded upon PROPOSITIONS, which, have occaſioned all the difficulty, confuſion,

confuſion, and perplexity, in which the NATURE of government, has been hitherto involved; and which have veiled it in the thickeſt miſt of cimmerian darkneſs.

But, upon an attentive examination, it will be found, that the objection is wholly grounded upon an error, which,—though very common,—is,—yet ſo groſs,—as that, —of MISTAKING,—an EFFECT,—for it's CAUSE.

Clearly and fully however, to demonſtrate this, I muſt beg leave, to trace out the ORIGIN and foundation of ALL MORAL PRINCIPLES.

A ſubject, upon which, I apprehend my opinions will be thought, to differ more from thoſe of *former* writers, than any poſition which has hitherto been advanced, upon the FIRST PRINCIPLES of government. Notwithſtanding therefore, *both* have the

the moſt indiſſoluble connection, and are inſeparably interwoven with each other, I muſt entreat you, Sir, and every one elſe, who *really wiſhes* to UNDERSTAND, the REASONING and CONCLUSIONS under that head, to vouchſafe me, the cooleſt, and moſt unprejudiced attention.

In the FIRST PLACE, I might, I apprehend, take for granted,—which is an act I am not in the habit of doing, that there are no INNATE IDEAS, and conſequently, —no INNATE MORAL PRINCIPLES, or NOTIONS;—ſuch as thoſe, I mean, which were formerly maintained. An opinion, which I doubt not, *you* will allow, has been properly exploded, being faſhioned, only, of "*ſuch ſtuff as our dreams are made of.*"

SECONDLY, that the word, CONSCIENCE, ſignifies only, the INTERNAL APPROBATION, and DISAPPROBATION, of which, we feel *ourſelves* to be the *objects*, either as we perform certain actions, or omit the

the performance of them, and vice verſa; but, that it DOES NOT imply alſo the RULE of ACTION ITSELF; which, at the time, we either conform to,—or tranſgreſs. Since, we muſt aſſuredly, have *firſt known* the *rule*, and learned, that, it was WORTHY of approbation, or diſapprobation, before we could feel ourſelves DESERVING, or, UNDESERVING of THOSE SENSATIONS.

But leſt you or any other of my readers, ſhould refuſe to admit, theſe PROPOSITIONS as TRUTHS, take the following, "*reductio ad abſurdum:*" which is equally applicable to *every ſpecies* of ſuppoſition,—of *innate ideas*,—*innate notions*,—and of a MORAL SENSE. For from the admiſſion of *any one* of them, then it would follow,—that ALL the RULES and PRACTICES, in *different* ſocieties, would be guided by ONE UNIFORM INSTINCT; and the SAME ACTIONS of conduct, would be INVARIABLY, and UNIVERSALLY APPROVED in

ALL

ALL the various countries, nations, and tribes upon earth. Which, is a circumſtance, we know to be REPUGNANT, to ALL the documents of hiſtory, and ALL the concluſions of experience.

From theſe DATA, then it neceſſarily follows, that the RULES of MORAL SCIENCE, muſt be deduced, as ALL OTHER SCIENCES ARE, from the INDUCTION of PARTICULAR FACTS; from which, are formed GENERAL PROPOSITIONS. But, as the SCIENCE of MORALS, or a SYSTEM of VIRTUE, is invented, to teach men, to regulate their behaviour to each other, UNIVERSALLY; NO SUCH SCIENCE, could POSSIBLY EXIST, 'TILL SOME PARTICULAR RULES had FIRST been layed down for THIS PURPOSE; as, THAT SCIENCE, muſt CONSIST LIKE ALL OTHERS, in GENERALISING PARTICULAR RULES. Hence then it likewiſe follows, that an UNION, muſt firſt have been formed amongſt mankind,

kind, and *particular rules* muſt have been tried, before, the GENERAL rules could have been FRAMED. Becauſe, as the *general* rules *conſtitute* the *ſcience*, and THESE muſt have been GENERALISED out of PARTICULAR rules, the LAST, muſt have been PRIOR, to the SCIENCE ITSELF.

From theſe premiſes then, the ORIGIN and PROGRESS of MORAL SCIENCE, clearly, and manifeſtly flow. For, in conſequence of the FREEDOM, LEISURE, and SECURITY, which men enjoy under the protection of any tolerably well regulated government, be it's form, what it will; the wants of men increaſing with increaſing numbers, impel men's minds to the diſcovery of the MEANS, beſt ſuited, to a conſtant ſupply of their gratifications. Hence, *firſt* ariſe, ſome of the more immediately uſeful, but moſt obvious arts and ſciences. But as by exerciſe, men's attention and faculty of reaſon, gradually ſtrengthen, and improve,

they advance in the diſcovery of others, certainly not leſs uſeful, but more abſtruſe. From much exerciſe in determining, the *quantum* of good, which reſults from one particular MODE of ACTING, in a preſent and particular caſe, they proceed to frame GENERAL PROPOSITIONS and PRINCIPLES, upon ALL ſubjects; and to have a habit of foreſight and ſagacity; by which, they are enabled to penetrate into remote conſequences; and to form compariſons, between very diſtant objects. Hence then, having obſerved, that the GRAND END, for which men united into ſociety, was to ſecure the GENERAL HAPPINESS of every order, rank, and ſituation; and that the MEANS to this, was by their UNIVERSAL OBEDIENCE to the WILL of their LEGISLATOR, who was appointed to CURB and RESTRAIN by LAWS, the inclinations and paſſions of thoſe, who would otherwiſe act contrary to that principle;—they ſoon learned to ABSTRACT from their PARTICULAR ſtate and ſituation, all thoſe GE-

NERAL

NERAL RULES, by which their actions are regulated, and to conceive them to be EQUALLY BINDING upon ALL mankind, in every place, whether, they do, or do not exist, as the LAWS of their PARTICULAR STATE. When they have advanced, *thus far*, then,—those who act according to those *universal principles*, without any reference to the punishments, which the *law* of the *state* inflicts,—they call,—VIRTUOUS;—and they who deviate from them,—they term,—VICIOUS; in *contradistinction* to those, who only obeying, or disobeying the *laws* of their particular government,—*as being* the *laws* of their government,—are denominated HONEST, or DISHONEST,—JUST or UNJUST.

Again, after men have turned their researches to the *nature* of *man*, and of the *human mind*, and deduced some *general* principles, from such an enquiry,—they begin to aspire after the acquisition, of

ſome knowledge,—of the DIVINE MIND, or of the NATURE of GOD. Some intimation of WHOSE EXISTENCE, and ſome ſcanty notion of HIS nature,—of his being the DIVINE LEGISLATOR, or rewarder and puniſher of man,—they had perhaps before reaped from ſome *immediate* or *remote* TRADITION. Impelled then by this curioſity, and aſſiſted, by this information, they began to endeavour to DEMONSTRATE, HIS EXISTENCE, from the DEDUCTIONS, of their own REASON. For, we invariably find, in ALL the PROOFS, in ALL nations, which are given of the EXISTENCE of a GOD, the FIRST ALWAYS is,—the *general*, —or as it is commonly, but not juſtly called, the UNIVERSAL BELIEF of that notion, in *other* countries.

As ſcience of all kinds advanced, and men attained to a more intimate knowledge of the WORKS of NATURE in *particular*,—they learned,—that THESE, are ALL

generally

generally conducive to the HAPPINESS of mankind; and finding, that *human* governments, which originated from the REASON of MAN, directly tended to the SAME END, —they concluded, that he who would *always* act upon *that* principle, would approach neareſt, and be moſt acceptable to God; and therefore inferred,—that a DIVINE GOVERNMENT,—muſt have been eſtabliſhed by the WISDOM of GOD,—*conducive* alſo to the SAME END; in conſequence of which, he would inflict puniſhments upon the vicious, and diſpenſe rewards to the virtuous.

SUCH is the SOURCE,—from whence,—ſpring the LAWS of VIRTUE, and every PRINCIPLE, whether right or wrong,—of what is called,—MORALITY, and NATURAL RELIGION. And indeed, much OBSERVATION, muſt have been made upon the WORKS of NATURE, ſo as to diſcern, that whatever *ſubordinate* agents might be *employed*,

ployed,—yet, ONE UNCONTROULABLE WILL directed the WHOLE, and the *faculties* of the *human mind* alſo, muſt have received a *conſiderable degree* of *cultivation*,—before, —*thoſe men*,—who had received *no immediate* REVELATION from HEAVEN,—or *certain tradition* of one,—could poſſibly have ceaſed to be POLYTHEISTS; notwithſtanding the information, which, a *primæval tradition*, might have faintly, though *generally* diffuſed.

But *Socrates*, and *Plato*, having moſt deeply inveſtigated, both the lower and the higher powers, and faculties of the *human mind*,—and by a moſt laborious cultivation of the faculty of INTELLECT, to a degree I may ſay with truth, FAR BEYOND that, to which the *moderns* have *yet arrived*,—clearly diſcerning the DIFFERENCE, and even OPPOSITION between MIND and BODY;—maintained,—that GOD would reward and puniſh men, in *another life*, in proportion

portion to their virtue or vice here; and as the *neceſſary foundation* to this doctrine, —attempted to raiſe it, upon a DEMONSTRATION of the NATURAL IMMORALITY of the HUMAN SOUL.

But, as the moſt elevated human intellect, CAN only be able to DEMONSTRATE, —that there is NO NECESSARY CONNECTION,—between the DISSOLUTION of the BODY, and the *conſequent* ANNIHILATION of the SOUL,—and can only ſhow, merely from PROBABLE arguments, drawn from the GENERIC DIVERSITIES in the NATURES of both,—and likewiſe, from our *faint conception* of the WISDOM and GOODNESS of GOD,—that *ſuch* a ſurvival of the ſoul, ſeems a *neceſſary mean* to the progreſs of virtue here, and it's reward hereafter,—the queſtion,—as to the minds *actual ſurvival*, was by the very NATURE of the EVIDENCE, *neceſſarily* involved (to the *generality* of the world) in much DOUBT, —great DIFFICULTY,—and no little perplexity.

plexity. Though certainly, to thoſe, who are capable of following theſe almoſt divine philoſophers in their ſpeculations, through the knowledge of the nature of MIND, which *they* diſcovered,—muſt confeſs,—that THEY raiſed the ſuppoſition, that God has conſtituted the HUMAN MIND, for a CONTINUANCE of EXISTENCE, *after* the diſſolution of the body,—to the very higheſt ſummit of proof, to which,—the nature of *that* ſpecies of evidence,—can POSSIBLY aſcend. But, as the queſtion, after which, they enquired,—was neceſſarily a queſtion of FACT,—it could not POSSIBLY be ASCERTAINED by REASONING,—but only,—as all other facts muſt be,—either,—by our own actual EXPERIENCE,—or, the TESTIMONY of others. Reaſoning being of no further uſe, even in inſtituting experiments, relative to the objects of our ſenſes,—than the *contrivances* of *means*,—to render ſome things *ſenſible*, which were before unperceived. But as in this life, we certainly can never EXPERIENCE, what is the will and IN-

TENTION of God, in reſpect to another, —they CANNOT POSSIBLY therefore, be MADE KNOWN to us, but by the TESTIMONY of SOME ONE,—who produces the AUTHORITY of GOD TO REVEAL THEM.

It muſt likewiſe be confeſſed, much as I admire and reverence the *Socraticos Viros*, as *Tully* ſome where calls them, that their ſuppoſition (though I know not that any one has before obſerved it in *this* ſenſe) was calculated, only in a manner, for *philoſophers*. As in the *ſocratic philoſophy*, virtue is ſynonimous with wiſdom, to which the vulgar could not aſpire; and VICE with IGNORANCE; in which they were neceſſarily involved. Not becauſe philoſophers, who diſcovered it, could not have inſtructed them in virtue, as *Sherlock*, (who was however one of the deepeſt thinkers, and cloſeſt reaſoners of this age, too much ſo, for the generality of readers to underſtand) has ſuppoſed. For *they* might

have been taught, VIRTUE as an ART,—as they are taught OTHER arts, without UNDERSTANDING the PRINCIPLES, which are the CONCLUSIONS of SCIENCE; but the real reaſon was, becauſe no HUMAN TEACHER'S AUTHORITY, ſupplied a ſufficient MOTIVE, to induce them to learn it, or urge them to practice it, if learned.*

Theſe enquiries, whoſe ſpeculations were comprehended under the name of PHILOSOPHY, when they were once begun, excited much attention, in the ableſt, and moſt enlightened minds; and continued to give

* There are animals, we know, who prefer thiſtles, nettles, thorns, and briers, to the fineſt graſs, of the richeſt paſtures. Similar to theirs, ſeem to be the taſtes of thoſe, who prefer, the weedy works of ſome other Engliſh divines, to the firm, and nouriſhing productions, raiſed by the genius of a *Sherlock*.

give exercise, to much acuteness of reasoning, and much subtilty of dispute. From hence arose therefore, a variety of dissensions, and divisions, not only amongst the *antients*, but likewise amongst the *moderns*, as they happened to be more or less prepossessed in favour of one, or other of the different GRECIAN PHILOSOPHERS, from whose speculations, such notions are chiefly derived, and propagated.

For, the disciples of *Socrates*, (excepting those who followed *Plato*) soon separated into various sects, and were divided by a multitude of opinions. And, not being able to satisfy themselves in the DEMONSTRATION of a future existence, *again* ABSTRACTED the LAWS of *virtue* from the WILL, and AUTHORITY of a LEGISLATURE, and the sanctions of FUTURE rewards and punishments. But then turning their enquiries to the SUMMUM BONUM, or what constitutes

the higheſt happineſs of this life; each, endeavoured to find out SOME PRINCIPLE, which would make VIRTUE, and the SUMMUM BONUM to be ONE.

Some, as the STOICS, maintained that VIRTUE, was indiſputably the SUMMUM BONUM, becauſe, the WISE and VIRTUOUS MAN, was *incapable* of ALL SUFFERING; as even PAIN, was to HIM, NO EVIL. For as HE, according to their maxims, muſt,—before he was entitled to thoſe appellations,—have learned to DESIRE nothing, but what HAPPENS to him; therefore it followed,—that no condition, nor event, could befall him,—but, what HE approved. A doctrine evidently true indeed, upon the PRINCIPLES of CHRISTIANITY; where, pain is *really no evil;* —becauſe it is neceſſary to lead man to ſeek, as the firſt object of his purſuit,—his FUTURE FELICITY. From whence it follows, as a corollary, that no event, can poſſibly

poſſibly happen to the real CHRISTIAN, which will not *conduce* to his *good*, if we take into our view, the whole extent of his being. But, upon any other ſuppoſition, this ſtoical doctrine is perfectly ridiculous. Becauſe it raiſes a ſuperſtructure, without a foundation,—which the mere preſſure, even of a ſingle ſtone, is at once able to deſtroy.

Some, with EPICURUS himſelf, for moſt of his diſciples miſrepreſented their maſter, founded the practice of it, upon the conſtant *eaſe* and *pleaſure*, or rather, *tranquility* of mind, which virtue affords. An opinion, which, if this world *only* be conſidered, every day's experience contradicts.

Some again with the PERIPATETICS, acknowledged that *outward objects*, afforded pain and pleaſure, and that though virtue therefore, did not produce the *only* ſatisfaction, yet, upon the *whole*, it afforded the GREAT-

EST

EST pleaſure. But this ſyſtem, by authoriſing ſuch a contrariety of purſuits, as ACKNOWLEDGED MEANS TO HAPPINESS, carries in it's own frame, the ſeeds of it's own deſtruction.

Others again with CICERO, who in his OFFICES adopted, only a part of Plato's doctrine, or rather ſtill more cloſely followed Panetius, founded VIRTUE on the HONESTUM, or the HONOURABLE; i. e. on the APPROBATION of mankind. A theory, which muſt ſhake with every blaſt. As, FAME for VIRTUE, no more than for SCIENCE, is, by any means diſtributed in proportion, to REAL MERIT. For, few men, can penetrate into the deep receſſes of the heart, where only it can be accurately diſcerned; and therefore, the artful, cunning, deſigning hypocrite, is often puffed into renown, by the public breath; whilſt, the wiſeſt and the beſt, are frequently expoſed to all the

the blaſts of envy,—and all the whiſpers of malignity.

But at length, GOD having been pleaſed to REVEAL HIS WILL to ALL mankind, both, —in reſpect to the AFFECTIONS, which are required from man,—the RULE OF CONDUCT he is to purſue; and the REWARDS or PUNISHMENTS,—which are to attend upon his obedience or diſobedience; men have now *abſtracted* STILL BETTER PRINCIPLES, from the DECLARATIONS of the GREAT AUTHOR, and formed them into ſyſtems, either of what they call VIRTUE,—or of what they call MORALITY,—or NATURAL LAW,—or NATURAL RELIGION. Hence, MANY have been induced to ſuppoſe, that becauſe theſe are *conſonant* with the *principles* of the CHRISTIAN RELIGION, *that religion* has revealed to us, *no other rules* of conduct, than what our own *natural reaſon* could diſcover; and notwithſtanding therefore, they admit

admit the *rules*, they reject the *authority*, upon which they are built; and even ridicule the *evidence*, by which, they are eſtabliſhed.

Mankind then, having totally forgotten, or, having never learned, what *experience* could have taught them, of the proceſs of the human mind, in the diſcovery of all the duties, which proceed from the exerciſe of their own faculties; and what, with all their application, they were incapable of diſcovering; whatever RIGHT or DUTY,—however diſcovered, which *appears* to them to be REASONABLE, they conclude, to have been the produce of that faculty, from it's earlieſt cultivation. Involved in this miſtake, they produce ſyſtems, as containing ORIGINAL, ETERNAL, and IMMUTABLE OBLIGATIONS, by which they aſſert, that ALL MEN were EVER bound to act, BEFORE the EXISTENCE of ANY GOVERNMENT; i. e. even before there

there was the *poſſibility* of the purſuit of any *inveſtigations*, which are the ONLY MEANS to *that* END. Thoſe then, who are once ſeduced into theſe errors, conſequently conſider, the above really *diſtinct*, and *ſeveral ſeparate* SPECIES of knowledge, as having only ONE SIMPLE INVARIABLE cauſe; and that cauſe, as being the SOLE ORIGIN of ALL men's VARIOUS RIGHTS, and DUTIES WHATSOEVER. Whereas, on the contrary, SO FAR, AS ANY of them, were DISCOVERED by MEN, they were only the DEDUCTIONS,—which they had made, in CONSEQUENCE of the RIGHTS, to which, GOVERNMENT FIRST GAVE BIRTH; and muſt therefore, be SUBSEQUENT, NOT PREVIOUS to IT'S EXISTENCE.

So likewiſe, ſuch a ſyſtem of doctrines as the CHRISTIAN REVELATION contains, could not have been attended with any benefit to mankind, *(except* to *thoſe*, to

whom it was given as a *completion* of a *former)* 'till the eſtabliſhment of *human governments* and *laws*, and the *tradition* of the EXISTENCE of a GOD,—had led men into ſpeculations, and enquiries, concerning WHAT actions, were moſt probably pleaſing to, that FIRST CAUSE, and PRESERVER of ALL THINGS. *This*, we may learn from *experience* of objects, which, if we do not actually ſee, are however made known to us in the pages of hiſtory. For, from it's records we learn; that there are now *many nations*, though they may be taught to believe, in the *authenticity* of the *chriſtian religion*, are, for want of the exerciſe, of their reaſon on civilization, and other arts, totally unfitted for the *practice* of it's *duties*.* And on the contrary, all thoſe in the moſt cultivated nations,

* See my COMMENCEMENT *Sermon*, before the *Univerſity* of Cambridge.

tions, who CONCEIVE *thoſe duties* to be NO OTHER, than what are DISCOVERABLE by REASON;—are incapable of embracing, and reliſhing, the *pureſt* and *ſublimeſt*, of it's doctrines. For they even deem *that*, to be MORAL *conduct*, which originates only in the NATURAL PASSIONS of mankind, —ſuch as VANITY,—PRIDE,—AMBITION, and REVENGE.

Thus, as *ſome* in their theory, do not diſcriminate the *various origins* of theſe ſyſtems, ſo *others* in their practice, confound their *different effects*. From whence it proceeds, that the SAME OUTWARD ACT, which is often done from VARIOUS MOTIVES, is in common language, in ALL theſe CASES, equally termed, GOOD, and VIRTUOUS. Whereas, upon the *principles* of *chriſtianity*, it is NOT the OUTWARD FORM,—but ONLY the MOTIVE,—which conſtitutes an act *virtuous*, or *vicious*. And therefore, *many may do*, what in common

 diſcourſe,

diſcourſe, are called *good actions*,—becauſe, in their *conſequences*, they are *attended* with *good* to others;—who are, by no means *really* entitled, to the denomination of GOOD MEN.

Whatever *ſyſtem* of MORAL DUTY however, be ſelected; and whatever be the *motive* choſen as the incentive, to urge us to correſpondent actions; *not one* of them, have the *leaſt tendency* to ALTER the RELATION, between the GOVERNOR and the GOVERNED; as to the RIGHT of COMMAND in the one, and of the DUTY of OBEDIENCE in the other. And, if the TRUEST, and SUREST principles be choſen, which are likewiſe ſanctioned by the STRONGEST MOTIVES, and of whoſe UNERRING RECTITUDE, there can be no doubt,—as they come from GOD'S WISDOM, NOT MAN'S REASON; THEY have, certainly at leaſt an *immediate* tendency, not only to *mollify*, and even to *ſubdue*, all thoſe paſſions of

of PRIDE, AMBITION, AVARICE, and REVENGE; which are, equally the CAUSES, of TYRANNY in the SOVEREIGN, and of RESISTANCE in the SUBJECT. THEY therefore, not only,—*teach*, but command the *former*, NOT to inflict any pain or penalty, but what is *abſolutely* neceſſary, to the PUBLIC GOOD; not indeed, under the penalty of their SUBJECT'S REBELLION, but of GOD'S PUNISHMENT. But, they likewiſe *inſtruct*, and *enable* the LATTER, by the moſt forcible injunctions, and the brighteſt examples of CHRIST, and his APOSTLES, where the GOVERNOR,—even NEGLECTS HIS DUTY,—to SUBMIT with PATIENCE, not only, "for WRATH, but "likewiſe,—for CONSCIENCE ſake."

And here, Sir, I can not forbear to obſerve, that as FALSE PHILOSOPHY, is continually receding farther, and farther, from CHRISTIANITY; ſo the TRUE, approximates as near to it, as *finite*, can, to *infinite*

infinite wiſdom. For, I have before fuggeſted to you, the *example* of *Socrates*, in HIS *obedience*, to the ſentence of his unjuſt judges. And could I, but prevail upon you, to read only *Plato's little dialogue, between Socrates and Crito*, and attentively to ſtudy, and digeſt it, it would perhaps impart to you infinitely more real benefit, than you ever received from *all* the volumes upon government, you have *formerly read*, or even the ESSAY, upon *that ſubject*, (as you call it) which you have *long ſince written*, and I *long ſince refuted*. For then,

Hi motus animorum, atque hœc *certamina tanta*,
Pulveris exigui jactu, compreſſa *quieſcant*.

If I fail in this appeal, to the FASCINATING NAME of PHILOSOPHY, the GRAND DIRECTRESS of MODERN TIMES; the *now* GUARDIAN

GUARDIAN PATRONESS of *France*, though *their* philoſophy is indeed totally different from *that*, I have juſt now recommended, —I deſpair of any efficacy,—from the *paſſages*, to which I have alſo, juſt now *referred* you, in the *pages* of CHRISTIANITY; perſpicuous as are their words, and conſequently, evident as is their ſenſe.

With *ſuch wonderful* plainneſs indeed, do they inculcate, both by *precept* and *example*, the DUTY of SUBJECTS to their RULERS, that one would think, it is actually impoſſible, for *every one*, who has not drank to the very dregs of MODERN PHILOSOPHY, and who really believes, in the TRUTH of the CHRISTIAN RELIGION, to WITHOLD his ASSENT from the DECLARATION, or to REFUSE his OBEDIENCE to the INJUNCTION. How mortifying ſoever it may be to ſome, to withdraw their allegiance from *modern philoſophers*, in ſubmiſſion to the higher *authority* of CHRIST;

CHRIST; yet, if they *do acknowledge*, the *authority* of the *laſt*, to be ſuperior, to that of the *former*, they muſt comply, and acknowledge, obedience in ſubjects, is due to their rulers, WHETHER THEY BE MILD and GENTLE, or CRUEL and TYRANNICAL:—Even impoſſible, as it appears to *ſome* of *your* admirers and ſcholars,—that ſuch a *declaration*, and *acknowledgment*,—ſhould be made by ANY ONE, in the concluſion, of this MOST ENLIGHTENED, EIGHTEENTH, CENTURY.

Nay, Sir, ſuch likewiſe, muſt neceſſarily have been the predicament, in which, even YOU YOURSELF, would have ſtood, had it not been, for that moſt HAPPY, and moſt WONDERFUL DISCOVERY, of a RATIONAL RELIGION; whoſe AUTHORITY, outweighs, the *authenticity* of REVELATION. A diſcovery, which ſome of the bigots of our eſtabliſhment, are too deſtitute of abilities, to comprehend. For they are ſo weak

weak as to conceive, that the words "RATIONAL RELIGION," and the RELIGION of REASON,—muſt be *ſynonimous*. But, as ſuch an imagination betrays, as you well know, the blindeſt ignorance;—I do not wonder, that we always ſee YOU,—your *admirers* and *followers*,—loſe your *meekneſs*, —your *patience*,—and your *temper*,—whenever you have occaſion to mention the ARTICLES, DOCTRINES, or MINISTERS of the *Church* of *England*.

For if the above ſtupid ſuppoſition, of ſome of the members of that *worſt* of all churches, for ſuch I am told, it is, in your writings, —were true,—then, the *groſſeſt* of all *abſurdities*, would follow,—viz.—that the CHRISTIAN REVELATION, and RATIONAL RELIGION, would be REALLY ONE, and, THE SAME THING. Becauſe, when once a REVELATION IS GIVEN TO ALL MANKIND,—THAT ALONE,—muſt be the only RATIONAL RELIGION;—IF it be REASONABLE, that

the CONJECTURES of MAN'S REASON,—ſhould SUBMIT to the DECLARATIONS of DIVINE WISDOM.

Whereas in fact, nothing can be more DIRECTLY OPPOSITE to *each other*, than GOD'S REVELATION, and what, YOU, call, RATIONAL RELIGION. The *latter* being a diſpenſation only to ſome CHOSEN FEW, to enable them to determine, by the ſuperior light of their faculties, but from the exerciſe of which we find, by experience, every received rule of LOGIC, muſt *firſt* be *diſcarded*,—what PARTS of GOD'S REVELATION they are *pleaſed* to *admit*, and what they *chuſe* to *reject*. Preciſely in the ſame manner, as we find, has likewiſe been imparted to them, the RIGHT of CHUSING, what laws of the legiſlature they will obey, and what, they will vilify and abuſe. So intimately connected, are your RELIGIOUS, and POLITICAL PRINCIPLES, and ſo cloſe is the ALLIANCE, which

which you conceive to exiſt, between RELIGION and CIVIL GOVERNMENT; and conſequently therefore, between CIVIL and RELIGIOUS ESTABLISHMENTS.

There may be ſome, Sir, perhaps, ſo ignorant, but I take for granted then, they can only be amongſt my brother miniſters of the eſtabliſhment, who, according to your repeated declarations, and thoſe of your friends, are the MOST IGNORANT of all divines; as to fancy,—SUCH a RATIONAL RELIGION, muſt neceſſarily be the offspring only of pride, vanity, and arrogance, becauſe, they imagine, that it's APOSTLES, and their converts, muſt conceive THEMSELVES to be WISER, than HE, who PROVED his AUTHORITY, to REVEAL the WILL of GOD. But if men, who are dull enough to make ſuch a ſuppoſition, were capable of reading an author, who though he was not of your ſect, was admirably well acquainted with your doctrines;—they

might learn,—that this claim to RATIONAL RELIGION, is one of the NATURAL IMPRESCRIPTIBLE RIGHTS of your PERSUASION. For this author, I mean the *learned Butler*, tells us,

> Suppoſe the Scriptures are of *force*,
> They're but *commiſſions* of courſe,
> And *Saints* have *freedom* to digreſs,
> And *vary from them* as *they pleaſe*.

Having thus accompanied you, to take a view of the foundation of the ONLY PRINCIPLES, which can enable you to REJECT, the otherwiſe DECISIVE and IRRESISTIBLE determination of REVELATION upon *this* ſubject; I will, by concluding this letter,—leave you to the pleaſing conſolation it affords.

And am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

LETTER

LETTER VI.

SIR,

HAVING already vindicated the ORIGIN of thoſe principles, which I have aſſigned above,—againſt the imputation of ERROR; I am now likewiſe to defend the CONSEQUENCES,—which reſult from them,—againſt the accuſation of ABSURDITY, and INJUSTICE.

To thoſe,—who having not the benefit of thoſe principles, with which the foregoing letter concludes, and by which, men are

are enabled to ſhelter themſelves, even from the CONVICTION, which REVELATION is fitted to impart, I doubt not, but I ſhall be able to defend the principles I have advanced, as clearly againſt the objection to their *conſequences*, as againſt the other to their *origin*.

Each objection, may perhaps upon a haſty and ſuperficial view, appear to be as weighty and valuable as gold. But when both are put into the oppoſite ſcale, to be tried with it, they will both be found in the balance of truth, totally deficient in their ſpecific gravities, and conſequently of no intrinſic value.

For, *firſt*, I not only moſt readily grant, that *no tyranny* or *cruelty* in a governor, can poſſibly be JUSTIFIED; ſo likewiſe I maintain, that the PRINCIPLES, which I have advanced, have not the remoteſt tendency, towards any attempt, at it's juſtification;—

but

but on the contrary, that they in the ſtrongeſt manner pronounce their condemnation.

I admit indeed, that from thoſe PRINCIPLES, it follows, that UNIVERSAL OBEDIENCE to the government, of whatever nature it be, whether it be adminiſtered by the uncontrouled WILL of ONE MAN, of a FEW, or of MANY;—or it be ſhared in any proportions, between ONE, a FEW, and MANY,—is EQUALIY, the DUTY of the *governed*. And, however the propoſition, when thus *plainly* and *unequivocally* ſtated, may appear to *ſome;* yet certainly, it is not only VIRTUALLY, but alſo POSITIVELY admitted by ALL, who allow, that an ABSOLUTE UNCONTROULABLE POWER, muſt exiſt SOMEWHERE, in EVERY STATE. For, amongſt all the airy viſions, and meteorous coruſcations, which are continually gliding through the political atmoſphere, of this floating Iſland;—THIS POSITION, has never, within the ſphere of my remembrance, been denied.

It being as ſelf-evident, at leaſt as any propoſition can be, that without *ſuch* an ABSOLUTE power, not only, no conſtitution could be of any *long duration*, but that it could not even for a moment, *ſubſiſt*.

For, if a government was even ſo abſurdly conſtituted, that the PEOPLE were under NO OBLIGATION to OBEY a law, 'TILL,—it had been PROPOSED to EVERY *diſtrict*, *city*, *town*, *village*, and *pariſh*, of a wide extended empire, and had been APPROVED,—by the MAJORITY of ALL the inhabitants,—*men*, *women*, and *children*,—THIS would not in the *ſmalleſt degree* INVALIDATE my CONCLUSION. Nay, the poſition would remain *equally true*, were even, *ſo abſurd*, a conſtitution of government to exiſt,—as the following,—which is perhaps ſtill *more* abſurd, than the foregoing;—viz. that the *majority* of the *people*, —*men*,—*women*,—and *children*, (and what could the moſt ardent lovers of LIBERTY and REPUBLICANISM *wiſh* for *more*) ſhould

in *every diſtrict, city, town, village,* and *pariſh,* have a RIGHT to RESIST every law, which they do not approve, the very *firſt time,* it was *attempted* to be *executed, after* it had been paſſed; and it is to *one* or *other* of theſe ABSURDITIES, ALL the plans of politicians in this *enlightened age,* ULTIMATELY TEND. For even then, there MUST be an UNCONTROULABLE ABSOLUTE POWER, *ſomewhere* EXISTING in the STATE, notwithſtanding the legiſlative power chiefly reſided (as no doubt it ought) in the very *dregs* of the people, (as they have been *inadvertently* called by ſome, who have the profoundeſt veneration for their judgment,) and who in that caſe, would indeed be the *enlightened legiſlators* of *ſuch* a conſtitution. But I ſay, that even then, for fear, that the people,—*after* they had *once* given their conſent to a law, which had been paſſed, for which, they had *then* a RIGHT to be aſked,—ſhould *afterwards* RESIST *that very* law, which they had *then*

NO RIGHT to diſobey,—the conſtitution, *muſt lodge*, ſome UNCONTROULABLE POWER SOMEWHERE, or, the government in ſuch a caſe, would be INSTANTLY DISSOLVED.

Should ſuch a bleſſed form of government as *this*, which now only exiſts in the *ſublime* ſpeculations of *modern politicians*, be once reduced to practice,—*then* indeed would be realized, that beautiful picture, ſeen by ſome, in their mental eye, ("*whilſt* "*in a fine phrenſy rolling,*") of the government, of ALL, by ALL. Oh glorious Æra! enviable ſtate! which ſome in their rapturous viſions ſee, near at hand! For how much ſuperior, both in happineſs, and duration, would it be even to that FIFTH MONARCHY,—which,—their forefathers likewiſe, in viſions, ſaw—*faſt approaching*. But which, luckily for their deſcendants,—who entertain the moſt rooted averſion, to the *very name* of a MONARCHY,—is *not yet come*; and of which, to their great joy, they have *now no* expectation.

But however, 'till the commencement of that other illuſtrious epoch, for which, the greateſt and ſageſt politicians of this age, are ſo devoutly wiſhing; whatever may be the NUMBER of the people, whether FEW or MANY, who, not being by the CONSTITUTION, veſted in any participation of the POWER, of MAKING or EXECUTING the laws,—ſhall notwithſtanding, take upon themſelves to DETERMINE,—WHAT LAWS they will OBEY, and WHAT, THEY WILL NOT, they certainly (whatever their phyſical power may be) *aſſume* a POWER in the ſtate, to which they have NO RIGHT. Becauſe they both annihilate the government, and revert into a *ſtate of nature*. For by ſuch a conduct, they diſclaim the RIGHT of the GOVERNOR or GOVERNORS to COMMAND, and if, HE or they, to whom the power of making and executing the laws in the ſtate be intruſted, EXERCISE his or their RIGHT, and DUTY, in the attempt to INFORCE them, meet with

RESISTANCE,—the people who arrogated the power to themſelves, to which they had NO RIGHT, are certainly in the eye of truth and reaſon the CRIMINALS, and not the LEGISLATORS and GOVERNORS,—as is the faſhionable opinion of the day, in oppoſition even to common ſenſe.

For, let us even ſuppoſe a caſe, in which, the people *think* the laws which they refuſe to obey, to be very contrary to the *general* happineſs, of the ſociety, for which the government was inſtituted; and let them in reality be *ever ſo much ſo*. Now, though the legiſlator can not be JUSTIFIED, in MAKING ſuch a law, reference being made to the laws of *virtue*, *morality*, or *religion:* Yet when enacted, he has, from the very *nature*, *eſſence*, and *principles* of government, a RIGHT to INFORCE them. Neither can RESISTANCE in the ſubjects, reference being had to the laws of *virtue* and *religion*, be JUSTIFIED.

Becauſe,

Becauſe, from the SAME NATURE of government, THEY are BOUND to *obey* them. Both parties indeed, would in ſuch a caſe, be guilty and AMENABLE to the LAWS of GOD; wherever, I mean, thoſe laws, have been made known, both to the legiſlator, and the people. And as it is the reliance, which each party has on it's own power, to ſubdue the other, which when UNRESTRAINED by RELIGION, can ever induce either party to MAKE AN APPEAL TO THE SWORD, when any difference in opinion, occurs between the governor and the governed,—NOTHING, can more EFFECTUALLY EVINCE the IMPORTANCE and NECESSITY of RELIGION, to the SUPPORT of CIVIL GOVERNMENT. It's aid being we ſee, INDISPENSABLY REQUISITE for the INSTRUCTION, BOTH of the governors, and the governed, in THEIR DUTY; and for the ſupply of both with HIGHER PRINCIPLES, and more FORCIBLE MOTIVES, to ſubdue their paſſions, and to regulate their reſpective conduct to each other; by SUBJUGATING the DE-

SIRES of BOTH PARTIES, to the WILL of GOD. REVERENCE, therefore for the DEITY and OBEDIENCE to HIS REVEALED LAWS, and a SACRED ATTENTION to ALL the MEANS, which LEAD to ſuch an END, are both the great CEMENT in EVERY PART, and the GRAND KEY-STONE in the WHOLE FRAME of CIVIL GOVERNMENT. Becauſe, it is evident, that without the controul of religion, there is no power to curb the DESPOTIC WILL of the GOVERNOR, but, the *fear* of the *rebellion* of the *ſubjects;* and alſo, that, WITHOUT IT'S INFLUENCE, NO RESTRAINT remains upon the STILL MORE LICENTIOUS WILLS OF THE SUBJECTS, when, all dread is removed from them, of the *ability* of the *ruler*, to *controul*. In either caſe,

is plucked from curb'd licence,
The muzzle of reſtraint, and the wild dog
Shall fleſh his tooth on every innocent.

This

This CONCLUSION, you perceive, Sir, not only flows directly and uninterruptedly from the foregoing PREMISES; but likewiſe as you will find, *neceſſarily* gives riſe to OTHER STREAMS OF KNOWLEDGE, with the SOURCES of which, you ſeem at preſent to be unacquainted; as they are certainly not to be diſcovered, by any directions, which have been pointed out by *Mr. Locke*. But, as theſe more properly belong to ANOTHER PART OF OUR ENQUIRY, and WILL, in THAT, be evidently diſcernible; I ſhall now ſeize this opportunity, of leaving you for a time to your lucubrations, that you may, if you chooſe *ſo* to employ the interval, MEDITATE upon this MOST VALUABLE, and conſequently moſt IMPORTANT of ALL SUBJECTS, which can either ſolicit man's attention, or engage his enquiry.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

LETTER

LETTER VII.

SIR,

AS, from the little knowledge I have of human nature, I apprehend, it to be moſt probable, that you have rather been endeavouring to find ſome broken link in the chain, by which my foregoing premiſes and concluſions are united, than to diſcover, what other links will naturally append to it, I ſhall in this letter, adapt myſelf preciſely to ſuch a meditation. For though I have not the ſmalleſt apprehenſion of your diſcovery, of a *flaw* in that *concatenation*, yet I doubt not, but you imagine,

imagine, that you have an inſtrument within your reach, by which you ſhall be able to ſhatter, the *whole chain*, into a thouſand fragments.

For, I apprehend, that you are ready to oppoſe to theſe principles, and concluſions, *that* ſophiſm, if I may be allowed the expreſſion, "*millies decies repetitum*" with little variation in *form*,—viz.—"that, "as the *very end*, for which government "was inſtituted, was the *general* happineſs "of the ſociety, it is *therefore abſurd* to "ſuppoſe, that the MAJORITY *can* be *bound* "to OBEY thoſe commands, laws, and in-"ſtitutions, to which, they have not by ſome "means or other, given their aſſent, which "is the UNALIENABLE RIGHT of ALL "MANKIND."

But, Sir, be pleaſed to conſider, that it is upon the *truth* of the TWO following

POSITIONS, that ALL GOVERNMENT WHATSOEVER WAS ORIGINALLY founded.

Firſt, that the MULTITUDE, are NOT the BEST JUDGES, of what, *will moſt* conduce even to their *own individual*, much leſs therefore, to the *general* happineſs of a ſociety.

And *ſecondly*, that, if, they COULD diſcover the MEANS, to this GREAT END;—they would not VOLUNTARILY impoſe upon themſelves, thoſe *reſtraints* which *are* neceſſary for it's attainment.

The truth of the FIRST of theſe poſitions, is *evident* from hence,—that the *bulk* of the people, can neither ſpare a ſufficient portion of time, to allot to *reflection*, nor conſequently therefore have the requiſite opportunity, for the acquiſition of that portion of *reaſon*, *underſtanding*, and *wiſdom*, which is abſolutely neceſſary, for the *ſe-*

lection,

lection, of the *propereſt* MEANS to that END, out of a *great variety* of circumſtances,—whoſe GENERIC, and SPECIFIC DIFFERENCES, can *not* be aſcertained, without much cloſeneſs of attention, and exactneſs of diſcrimination. For ſurely, LEGISLATION, conſidered as a SCIENCE, at leaſt requires *as good* ABILITIES for it's ACQUISITION as *any other* SCIENCE; and when conſidered as an ART, demands as *habitual* an application, and *ſkill* for it's PRACTICE, as *any other* ART.

The truth of the *ſecond* propoſition, is *not leſs* evident than that of the firſt. For, were the *multitude*, capable of *diſtinguiſhing*, what *is moſt* conducive to THEIR GENERAL GOOD; upon WHAT PRINCIPLE, I beſeech you, could they be INDUCED to CHOOSE it, in *preference*, to the *immediate* gratification of ſome *deſire*, *inclination*, and *paſſion*, *eſpecially* when,—as in the caſe ſuppoſed,—there was *no expectation* of *any*

 puniſhment,

puniſhment, or controul whatſoever, to *inforce* it? Will you ſay,—they might derive ſufficient motives from the LAWS OF VIRTUE, or of MORALITY. But, before you can maintain this,—you muſt have totally forgotten, what, has been already *fully* proved,—that *had* ſuch a poſition as this, been *originally* admitted, as the JUST *principle* of ALL government, viz:—that the *people*, OUGHT either to *make*, or, *when made*, give *their approbation* to the LAWS, before they ſhould be obliged to OBEY them; then,—NO SUCH LAWS as THOSE of VIRTUE, COULD EVER have been DISCOVERED by human reaſon, for the regulation of human conduct. For, it has been clearly ſhown, that THEY, are all built, upon the EXPERIENCE, which is derived from the UTILITY of GOVERNMENT, in COMPELLING the multitude, to SACRIFICE the gratification of their PRIVATE, inclinations, and SELFISH paſſions, to the GENERAL happineſs of the SOCIETY; and, that from thence,

thence, theſe GENERAL LAWS of VIRTUE and MORALITY, were DEDUCED; to comprehend, within the bonds of their obligation, ALL MANKIND.

If however, you will *reject this ſyſtem of mine*, as too novel for your appetite, and will go back to the old ſyſtem of *any other* writer, upon the ORIGIN of MORAL OBLIGATION; you will find;—that your argument, by "*proving too much,—proves no-*"*thing.*" For, if the laws of *virtue* and *morality*, *are able* to INDUCE the multitude to *ſacrifice* upon *all* occaſions, their own PRIVATE GRATIFICATIONS to the PUBLIC GOOD,—then it follows,—that *all civil government*, is altogether unneceſſary, and uſeleſs, either to the guidance, or reſtraint of men's volitions, and inclinations. Whereas to produce this GREAT END, was *really* the SOLE PURPOSE of IT'S FIRST INSTITUTION.

Will

Will you then maintain, that however *falſe*, *ſuch* a poſition WOULD have been *formerly;* yet as GOD has been pleaſed to REVEAL HIS WILL, to ALL mankind, there can be no objection to the admiſſion of SUCH a PRINCIPLE of government *now;* becauſe, CHRISTIANITY, ſupplies ALL MEN, with a SUFFICIENT MOTIVE to SUCH a conduct?

If *this*, ſhould be your argument; permit me to remind you; *firſt*, that, as chriſtianity ſupplies motives, *equally efficacious* to the *governors*, as to the *governed;* by *parity* of *reaſoning*, there is much *leſs neceſſity* NOW, to admit the people into any *participation* of the *legiſlative power*,—than there was *formerly;* becauſe there is *now* therefore by your own confeſſion, an *additional reſtraint* upon the TYRANNY of GOVERNORS. And CHRISTIANITY, certainly *does not* ſupply the people, with *that knowledge*, which is *neceſſary* for making

CHANGES

CHANGES in governments; though, *it* furniſhes them, with *that wiſdom*, which is *requiſite*, for THEIR OBEDIENCE to governors. For it even gives us, *particular* caution, "to BEWARE of THOSE,—who "are GIVEN TO CHANGE."

Secondly, had you been aware of the *conſequences*, which *follow* from *this* argument,—they would have made you "*ſtart* "*aſide, like a broken bow.*" For ſuch an argument, by the ſubſtitution of *another* principle, inſtantly *deprives* the people of *their claim*, to a *ſhare* in the *legiſlation*,—upon the *pene divinum* plea,—of NATURAL RIGHT.

Thirdly, if, becauſe, *God* has vouchſafed to *inſtruct* man in his duty, we are *therefore* according to *your ſyſtem* of *logic*, to *conclude*, that ALL MEN WILL NECESSARILY UNDERSTAND, and PRACTISE it; this happens unfortunately to you, to be

a

a concluſion, which *daily experience* contradicts, from the *very evidence* of your own, and your friends conduct. For, though the chriſtian religion inculcates into it's votaries, univerſal SUBMISSION to *rulers*, there is not a day paſſes over our heads, in which, either *you*, or *ſome* of *your* aſſociates, do not contradict this, by inculcating, NOT OBEDIENCE, but RESISTANCE to government, as the GRAND DUTY of SUBJECTS.

But, if this concluſion were not even *thus irreconcileable* with FACT;—yet, *mark well*, I beſeech you,—what ſtill *muſt* be, the *melancholy tendency* of it's *conſequences*. For though, certainly ſuch a concluſion; might be *productive* of the *moſt* IMPORTANT benefits, by raiſing a ſtorm, which would EXTIRPATE every *root*, and *branch*, of our RELIGIOUS ESTABLISHMENT; "*a* "*conſummation*, *by you*, (no doubt,) *devoutly to be wiſhed*;" yet unluckily,—it would

in

in it's fury,—hurry away with it likewiſe, —every timber, brick, and ſtone of every diſſenting miniſter's meeting-houſe in the whole world.

For, admitting this doctrine to be true; it would then be an act of *robbery*, in *every miniſter* of *every* denomination, to demand *contributions*, any more, than *tithes* from their congregations. Or at leaſt, it would be but a *ſwindling trick*, in them, to cozen their congregations out of their money, by pretending,—to *ſell* them a *commodity*, of which they were in full poſſeſſion, without the payment for it, even of a ſingle doit.

I have ſome conſolation however, in thinking, that how frequently ſoever, ſuch a doctrine as this, I am now combating, may be advanced;—that it ariſes only from the *laudable motive*, of *rendering* our PRESENT CIVIL and RELIGIOUS ESTABLISH-

MENT CONTEMPTIBLE, in the eyes of IT'S SUBJECTS; and by theſe means, *encouraging* them, as far as can be done, *with ſafety*, to *overturn* it, and bury it's doctrines, and it's miniſters, in the ruins.

For, I cannot think, that *even* YOU, SIR, and then it is impoſſible to conceive, that ANY ONE ELSE, would be willing to put *ſuch* a doctrine, to the only *ſure teſt* of it's truth,—EXPERIENCE. That is to ſay,—to try,—whether the multitude,—(I mean,)—not only barely the *majority*, but an almoſt infinite number *above* a majority, (for if a majority has a RIGHT, a *fortiori*, a *larger* number has ſtill *more right*, to MAKE LAWS) are not BEST QUALIFIED, to ENACT LAWS for the *general* happineſs; and whether, they will not MOST READILY OBEY them, when, *all temporal penalties* are removed; and nothing remains to inforce them, but merely the more *remote influence* of *religious ſanctions*.

tions. For it ſhould ſeem, that the *National Aſſembly* of *France*, even in *their* MULTIPLICITY of EXPERIMENTS, all founded, upon the REVERSE of every concluſion, deduced from *experience* of the *nature* of *man*, have not *yet* advanced *quite ſo far*, as to try *this*; as they have neither given at preſent, a MAJORITY of the PEOPLE, a RIGHT of MAKING LAWS, nor even of CHOOSING REPRESENTATIVES. Yet THEY have in *reſerve*, a *much more powerful engine* of their own contrivance, to ENFORCE OBEDIENCE, than as *they* think, ANY REVELATION FROM GOD, can poſſibly be;—you already gueſs that I mean, —their intended *frame* of *inſtitutes*,—for the EDUCATION of a CITIZEN.

'Till therefore, the legiſlators of *other* nations are become *even wiſer*, than thoſe *enlightened ones* in France, who have diſcovered REVEALED RELIGION to be a JEST,—and INJUSTICE to be NO VICE;—

and that PILLAGE, ROBBERY, MURDER, and SACRILEGE, are the FOUR CARDINAL VIRTUES; the ſubjects of *other* nations, muſt be *content* to OBEY the *laws*, of their reſpective governments, though they ſhould not happen to *enact* them. Nay, though they ſhould, even chance to think, that a law does *not* contribute to the *greateſt general* happineſs;—they are ſtill bound to obedience,—from a PRINCIPLE; which is the *foundation* of ALL GOVERNMENT, and therefore paramount to all other conſiderations. For where ever, a *legiſlature* exiſts, though it be compoſed of *fallible* men, it follows, from the very *definition* of the term, that *it* has a *right* to MAKE, and the *executive power*, has a RIGHT to enforce *ſuch laws*, as ſeem to THEM, *beſt* calculated to produce the *general* happineſs: and *ſubmiſſion* to them, is the DUTY of ALL the SUBJECTS. THIS is a PRINCIPLE of UNIVERSAL OBLIGATION, which is common to ALL LAWS, from the

VERY

VERY ESSENCE of the *thing*, whether, they are laws made by the legiſlature of a *particular* ſtate,—whether, they are the LAWS of *virtue*, or of *morality*, deduced by men's reaſoning faculties, or *ſanctioned* by the REVELATION, of an INFALLIBLE LEGISLATOR.

Strange, and *almoſt inconceivable*, as the foregoing poſition may appear, to many at *firſt ſight;* yet, it is in *fact*, not only *perfectly intelligible*, but likewiſe *very eaſily proved.* For, were *individuals* left to themſelves to determine, when even *thoſe general laws*, of *morality* and *religion*, ſhould be obeyed, and when not; *many*,—or *all*, —*even* perhaps of THEM, would NOT APPEAR to be *always* conducive to the *general good.* On the contrary, it would appear to the fallible optics of the wiſeſt men, that GREATER GOOD in *particular* caſes, might ariſe from the non-obſervance, than from acting in *conformity* to them.

But

But why then, it may be aſked, did *men* deduce *ſuch general* laws, and reduce them into a ſyſtem of morality, and why is UNIVERSAL OBEDIENCE to them required? For how then, can ſuch a requiſition, be for the *general good?*

The anſwer, is, plain, and obvious and even familiar. Becauſe, though *more apparent* good, might even ariſe, from a NON-COMPLIANCE with them, in ſome *particular* caſes; yet, were a *permiſſion* given to each *individual*, to *judge* for *himſelf, when*, obedience to them, was *proper*, and *when not; ſuch* a permiſſion, would be in *effect*, an ABROGATION of them AS LAWS, and would often authorize the perpetration of murder, adultery, robbery, and every ſpecies of injuſtice, for the *prevention* of which, they were, in ALL CASES intended.

Preciſely

Preciſely therefore, for the ſame reaſon alſo, it is, that *ſuch* a permiſſion can *not* be granted to *ſubjects;* which, is not only contended for as a *theoretical truth*, but DEMANDED as the NATURAL UNALIENABLE RIGHT of MAN, and of the PRACTICE of which, *through all it's conſequences*, it is affirmed to be an *act* of *injuſtice*, *cruelty*, *oppreſſion*, and *tyrannny* in *any government*, to deprive *any*, even the loweſt, of it's members. For if it were, the LAWS of the STATE, would likewiſe, in this caſe, as the *laws* of *virtue* in the former, *be in effect* ANNULLED,—government would be diſſolved;—men would again fall into that very *ſtate* of *nature*, and of ANARCHY, which involves them in infinitely more miſery, than, the very WORST FORM of CIVIL GOVERNMENT, can POSSIBLY PRODUCE.

Hence then it follows, that if an human legiſlature, even *enjoins* it's ſubjects, either

either to *omit* any action, of which, by the *laws* of *virtue*, or *religion*, the *omiſſion* appears to them, to be wrong; or *commands* them to *perform* ſome action, which when brought to the ſame TEST, *appears* to *them* to be VICIOUS or WICKED; it does not then become their DUTY to *reſiſt* and *rebel*, but they are bound QUIETLY to *ſubmit* to the *loſs* of the ſeeming good, however great it might be, which they would have obtained, by a *compliance* with the laws; or to any *other* inconvenience or *pain*, which they might ſuſtain, in conſequence of *diſobedience*. Exactly, as in all other caſes whatſoever, where we would regulate our conduct, by the rules of *virtue* or *morality*, whenever any pleaſure, or ſeeming advantage, might be obtained by the *gratification* of the PASSIONS, *ſuch* pleaſure and advantage, *muſt* be *ſacrificed*, to the *laws* of *virtue*, and *religion*.

However *wrong* therefore, a legiſlature may be in *enacting ſome* laws, yet, the people

people are ſtill bound to *obey* them, unleſs ſuch laws are deſtructive of ſome particular *conſtitution*, by making a *breach* in the *compact*, *between* the GOVERNED and the GOVERNORS; in that PARTICULAR FORM of government; and for *which breach*, that VERY CONSTITUTION has PROVIDED a REMEDY, by AUTHORISING in *ſuch caſes*, the PEOPLE'S DISBOEDIENCE. But a *refuſal* of *obedience* in the *ſubjects*, to the ACTS of the LEGISLATURE, much more reſiſtance or rebellion, muſt be in ALL OTHER CASES, at ALL TIMES, offences of the moſt complicated guilt, and crimes of the deepeſt dye. For, the *magnitude* of the *guilt*, muſt not only be eſtimated,—by the *uncontroulable violence* of the PASSIONS, in the firſt, and more immediate agents;—but alſo, by the *number*, and heinouſneſs of the crimes, of which, *they* are only *mediately*, or even *remotely* the *cauſes*;—and likewiſe by the unmeaſurable inundation of evils,—which, iſſuing forth from both

 theſe

theſe ſources,—raging in a reſiſtleſs torrent, —muſt neceſſarily overwhelm the *whole kingdom*,—in ruin, and deſolation.

So truly *trifling*, *falſe* and *ſophiſtical*, (and I ſhould add contemptible, but for fear of giving you offence) are theſe ARGUMENTS, and ALL OTHERS likewiſe, which, are founded upon the ſandy, or rather undiſcoverable foundation, of the NATURAL RIGHTS OF MEN. Notwithſtanding therefore, the NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF FRANCE, have advanced THEM, as the FIRST PRINCIPLES OF ALL GOVERNMENT, in their DECLARATION OF RIGHTS,

> Which, now to ſenſe, and now to nonſenſe, leaning,
> Mean not, but blunder round about, a meaning.

and though, even the PEOPLE have SANCTIONED *cettes lanternes*, by the penalty of the *lantern poſt;* yet, the venerable MINORITY of that motley body, enliſted under the

the banners of REASON, muſt ever brand them with reprobation, and reject them with contempt.

To our moſt ſincere wiſhes, and hopes, therefore, may we not add alſo, our firm truſt, and confidence, that theſe "*unſubſtan-*" "*tial pageants,*" called NATURAL RIGHTS, are now "*diſſolved,*" and will be no longer

——— *blown with reſtleſs violence*
round about the pendant world.

That *you*, may have time, by conſidering what has been already ſaid, to form the ſame hope, breathe the ſame wiſh, and attain to the ſame truſt and confidence,—I ſhall conclude this letter, remaining

Sir,

Yours, &c.

LETTER VIII.

SIR,

I HOPE you have had now sufficient leisure, most *maturely* to weigh, the *words*, NATURAL RIGHTS, and to exile them for ever from your mind, to the regions of nonsense; where only they could have their birth, from the union of ERROR, with ANARCHY. For, if those, which are called RIGHTS were NATURAL; —then GOVERNMENT would be UNNATURAL. And if all men claim it, as their NATURAL RIGHT TO DO AS THEY PLEASE, NO GOVERNMENT CAN POSSIBLY EXIST.

The

The only queſtion therefore, which a *ſubject* can aſk himſelf, under ANY SPECIES OF GOVERNMENT, is *not*, what RIGHTS ſhould, I WISH to have, and therefore may *claim* as INDEFEASIBLE;—but,—

Firſt, WHAT ARE the RIGHTS,—to which, —I am *entitled*, by the CONSTITUTION of the government, under which, I live.

Secondly, whether, ſuch others, as I ſhould *wiſh* to have,—WOULD be COMPATIBLE with the preſent *particular* RIGHTS, and *general wiſhes* and *welfare* of my fellow ſubjects.

Thirdly, whether I, and thoſe who entertain the ſame inclinations, and opinions with myſelf,—are *likely* to obtain them from the legiſlature, without DISTURBING, —the TRANQUILITY,—PEACE,—and HAPPINESS,—of the ſociety?

For,

For, the GENERAL HAPPINESS of the WHOLE kingdom, is certainly the GRAND END, to which, every *law* ſhould tend; even *more invariably*, than the needle, when touched by the loadſtone, does actually turn towards the pole. Where, therefore, under any conſtitution of government, the legiſlature enacts any law, which can *impart* a GOOD, to *ſome*, which they did *not before* enjoy, or *remove* from them, ſome INCONVENIENCE, which they before ſuſtained,—*without* SUBJECTING the reſt, to INJURY or INCONVENIENCE:—*there*,—the government is IMPROVED.

In ſuch a caſe, however, the legiſlature, ſhould moſt cautiouſly attend, to the *very wide* diſtance, there is, between the REMOVAL of an *actual pain*, or poſitive inconvenience; and the CONFERRING of NEW POWER.

For,

For, to the *former*, a man may be ſaid to have *ſome claim*, from the laws of morality, and religion. *To* the *other*, he can not pretend, to ſet up even any *moral* plea whatſoever; but there may be not only many political, and conſtitutional, but likewiſe even ſome *moral* objections *againſt* it. So likewiſe, even in the *removal only* of pain, or ſome poſitive inconvenience, the legiſlature, ſhould not only attend to the *immediate*, but alſo, to the remoter conſequences, which may reſult from it; as to the probable converſion of the *freedom* from PAST RESTRAINT, into the *acquiſition* of FUTURE POWER.

For no argument, can poſſibly be more abſurd, or contradictory, in *any ſet of men*, even, *ſuppoſing* the *fact* to be *true*, upon which they build it; than to pretend,—that they have a *claim* to any ſuch indulgent relaxation, of the rigour of the laws, —*becauſe*, *whilſt* they were *under this reſtraint*,

ſtraint,—they were *quiet* and *peaceable* ſubjects. As *this*, only proves, that the laws had anſwered the purpoſe, for which they were enacted; viz. that of making quiet ſubjects of thoſe,—who were reſtleſs and refractory, before the paſſing of thoſe laws. But, BECAUSE, it was for the *very purpoſe* of *producing* this *effect*, that the *reſtraint was* layed upon them;—FOR THAT VERY *reaſon*,—their *paſt loyalty* and *obedience*, under *ſuch* circumſtances, however great they might have been,—*can not* poſſibly, be *any* PLEDGE, or SECURITY for their *future conduct*,—*when*,—*that* VERY RESTRAINT,—ſhould be REMOVED.

A more ample, and indiſputable illuſtration, and confirmation, of the *truth* of theſe obſervations, can *not* be given,—than that,—with which, you yourſelf have been ſo kind as to ſupply us, in your twelfth letter, page 122.

For

For there you ſay, "time was when "(the Church of England) pretended, to "*fear where no fear was*, and being then "VIGOROUS,—her cries were heard, *as the* "*roaring of a lion.* Of late, ſhe has "BEEN SO FEEBLE, that, WE ONLY "AMUSE OURSELVES WITH THEM, and "*now* the DANGER is *really* TRANSFER-"RED FROM US, to THEMSELVES."

Now, what does, this very *plain*, and *explicit declaration*, amount to,—BUT THIS very kind information,—that we were FOOLS, to *take away* the *penal laws*, againſt you, and your friends; for, that YOU, having now acquired power,—notwithſtanding all your *pretences* to liberality of ſentiment, and chriſtian charity;—to loyalty to the King, and love to your Country;—notwithſtanding your claim to a *monopoly* of *all* the *wiſdom* and *virtue* in the kingdom,—WILL eagerly ſeize *every opportunity*, (and you go on, to point out the opportunities, which

will be afforded) of USING that VERY POWER,—to the DESTRUCTION of your truly *liberal*, and *generous* benefactors.

Permit me however, from REAL TENDERNESS, to you, and your friends;—do not ſtart,—you may venture to believe it without heſitation, for my conduct has been always firm and manly towards them; (the open oppoſer of their opinions and doctrines,—but more than once a cordial friend, and warm advocate for the men who held them,) to recommend to you, *more caution*, not only in your declarations of your *future intentions*,—but likewiſe,—in your *preſent conſtant exhibitions*, of your rooted prejudices;—your bigotted animoſity,—and your unchriſtian hatred,—to the *Church of England*,—it's *doctrines*,—and it's *miniſters*. *Perſecuting* the latter as you do,—which is, *as far as you can*,—in their literary fame,—wherever, you can get the command of a periodical publication,—however *liberal they*

may

may be in their ſentiments, towards *all* other ſects. Miſrepreſenting likewiſe, thoſe who aſſociate with you, from principles of liberality, and of chriſtian charity,—as courting your company, for the ſake of inſtruction,—and as leaving the ſociety, of their bigotted brethren of the eſtabliſhment,—from their predilection, for the *more enlarged ſentiments* of *your* ſect.

Remember, Sir, that the LION of the foreſt, alſo, does not *always roar*,—but may ſometimes condeſcend to ſuffer, ſome of the lower tribes of animals, (even perhaps ſome of that ſpecies, which moſt reſemble, and moſt delight in imitating men,) to play around him,—admit them into ſome familiarity,—protect them from their moſt ferocious enemies,—and divert himſelf with their gambols,—though they ſhould be expreſſive only of their vanity, and their weakneſs. But if, from this indulgence, they, growing bold, and petulant, ſhould

miſtake his gentleneſs for ſupineneſs,—and his meekneſs for indifference,—and once more rouſing him from his repoſe,—he does but begin to ſhake his ſhaggy mane, and utter his deep-toned roar,—they would inſtantly be ſtruck aghaſt with horror,—and in a moment, ſcramble away to the firſt cover they could find, ſmall enough, to hide them, from his awakened fury, and tremendous ſtrength.

But, let us lay aſide metaphor, and return to the ſubject, more immediately before us. When, *again*, the executive and legiſlative powers, GIVE UP any power, with which by the conſtitution, they happen to be entruſted,—and of which, they are conſcious,—the HAPPINESS of the SOCIETY, do not REQUIRE the EXERCISE; —becauſe the *exertion* of it, could only ſerve to the gratification of the paſſions, of thoſe, in whom thoſe powers are lodged,—who have their *weakneſſes* and *frailties*

in

in *common* with all other men:—in *that* caſe *likewiſe*,—there is,—we ſay,—an alteration in the government, and a *reformation* in the *conſtitution*. The UTMOST CARE, and CAUTION however, muſt *alſo* be uſed on SUCH AN OCCASION, in every conſtitution, where, the *legiſlature*, *conſiſts* of DIFFERENT BRANCHES;—TO PREVENT the POWER, which may thus be SURRENDERED by ONE of them, from being TRANSFERRED TO ANY, or ALL of the OTHERS. For where this is the conſequence,—the balance of the conſtitution,—inſtead of being *amended*,—may be *totally deſtroyed*.

In any ſuch caſes likewiſe,—where, the governors of the ſtate, do not of their own accord, paſs ſuch laws,—the governed may under *all* the various forms, of different conſtitutions,—perhaps, without any breach, either of their *moral duty*, or their *obedience* as *ſubjects*,—*petition* for alterations;—provided, they do ſo, with that reſpect,

reſpect, which is *always due* from *ſubjects*, to the *ſupreme power* in *every* ſtate;—and quietly SUBMIT, if, *that power* think differently from them,—as to the PROPRIETY, of *granting*, the objects of their petitions. For, from it's deciſion, there can not poſſibly be, under *any* government, ANY LAWFUL APPEAL; nor even from it's ERRORS, and it's PREJUDICES, any RIGHTFUL REDRESS.

Very unacceptable, and even diſagreeable no doubt, muſt THESE TRUTHS appear to thoſe of our *modern political innovators*,—who miſtake every popular, propoſed alteration, for an excellent reformation, in a conſtitution;—which is,—and long has been, an object of admiration,—to ſome ſtates, and of envy,—to others.—To thoſe, who deem an edifice to be increaſing in beauty, the nearer it approaches, to a mere exhibition of ruins.—To thoſe, who fired by their own enthuſiaſm, conceive every ſuggeſtion

tion of fancy, to be an object of experience.—To thoſe, who more lukewarm in themſelves, but heated by mixing in frequent crouds, receive from, and communicate, the flame of their prejudices, and their paſſions, to each other.—To thoſe, who however really ignorant they are, yet by a conſtant reciprocation of flattery, believe themſelves to be irradiated with ſupereminent light, and to be poſſeſſed of the utmoſt ſtore of knowledge.—To thoſe, who not being often admitted under vaulted roofs, miſtake the reverberations of their own voices within, for ſhouts of approbation, from crouds, without.—To thoſe, who,—becauſe hundreds of men, of genuine genius and learning, who live retired in their rural ſhades, content themſelves only with deſpiſing their *book-making*, and their *puffing*, (but not chuſing to encounter their virulence and abuſe, do not reply to them) preſume therefore, from the ſilence of thoſe, who differ from them,

that

that their own opinions, are deemed, to be, incapable of refutation.—To thoſe, who valuing themſelves upon their art,—cunning,—and addreſs, though they have not much knowledge of the world, and ſtill leſs of human nature, fancy, that the real roughneſs, rudeneſs, and fierceneſs of their diſpoſitions, are not perceived, on account of the ſometimes affected ſmoothneſs, ſoftneſs, and ſubtleneſs of their outward demeanor;—and imagine that where a ſmile is forced, upon the rigid, unrelaxing muſcles of their mouths,—there can be no ſuſpicion, of rancour, rankling in the heart.

In all theſe,—and ſuch as theſe characters, however various may be their diviſions and ſubdiviſions,—however ſimilar they may be in ſome features,—and diſſimilar in others,—yet in ALL of them,—no doubt,—THESE TRUTHS will almoſt equally excite diſpleaſure, and perhaps exactly in proportion

proportion to the ſtrength of the arguments in their ſupport, exaſperate their reſentment.

Yet, though I am unwilling, to be the cauſe of pain to any one, and if I know my own heart, never intend to excite it, except, when, as I am now bound in duty, for the promotion of the happineſs of others:—of ſo great importance, do I deem theſe truths to be;—that ſhort as this letter is, I ſhall here conclude it; that you, and my other readers may have the more time, ſeriouſly to conſider, and accurately to weigh them;—and attentively to ſcrutinize into all the *numerous*,—and if neglected,—*dangerous*, *conſequences*,—which follow in their train.

For, however the almoſt ſacred name of LIBERTY, may be uſed as the denomination, of the darling object of the diſcontented, under *any form* of government;

it is certainly very ſeldom ſo employed, but, as a ſtalking-horſe; whilſt in reality, the LOVE of POWER, ſkulking behind it, affords men an opportunity of aiming at the deſtruction of every thing, which, whilſt it exiſts, obſtructs their ſelfiſh inclinations, or by it's extinction, ſupplies them, with food for their PRIDE,—their AVARICE, —and their AMBITION.

" O for that warning voice, which he who ſaw
" Th' Apocalypſe, heard cry in heaven aloud."

But if *that*, be not any more permitted to reach the ear of mortals; let BRITONS however, be warned by a voice which now cries *aloud*, and *ſpares not*, from the oppoſite ſhore. Which, bids the SONS of ALBION BEWARE, what experiments they try upon their conſtitution, either in church or ſtate;—bids them BEWARE,—of the FASCINATION from the *well ſounding words*,—PHILOSOPHY,—ENLIGHTENED TIMES,—LIBERTY,—and NATURAL RIGHTS;—leſt,—inſtead

inſtead of finding the RETURN of a SATURNIAN REIGN,—*they* ſhould *fall* a *ſacrifice* to AMBITION,—PRIDE,—INJUSTICE,—IGNORANCE,—and BARBARISM, marching in the van;—or to,—FURY,—CRUELTY,—DESPOTISM,—SLAUGHTER,—and DESOLATION, maddening in the rear.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

LETTER IX.

SIR,

HAVING now, not only, I truſt, totally DESTROYED every PLEA to the CLAIM of any privileges in ſociety, from the *natural* RIGHTS of men;—having alſo, I doubt not, for ever *expelled* the *words* from any future admiſſion, *amongſt* the *terms*, which *appertain* to the SCIENCE of POLITICS;—having likewiſe I hope, clearly, and evidently traced, the ORIGIN, and PROGRESS of MORAL SCIENCE, through a path, which though neglected by all former writers,—was the only one, in which they

they *ought* to have proceeded;—and laſtly, —having pointed out the vaſt care and attention, with which, even *any* reformation ought to be made in ANY SPECIES of GOVERNMENT;—it ſeems to me, to be very probable, that in future,—for the terms, NATURAL RIGHTS,—MORAL RIGHTS, will in general be ſubſtituted. And perhaps, if NO CAUTION were given to prevent it; the LATTER words, might, at no diſtant time be uſed, as the FORMER have long been;—only as *bugbears*, to frighten every one, from *venturing* to *examine* the TRUTH or FALSEHOOD of any propoſition, ſo entitled; upon the ſuppoſition, that ALL POSITIONS which were SO CHARACTERISED, *had a* CLAIM from EVERY ONE, to an IMMEDIATE and UNHESITATING ASSENT.

Thus perhaps for inſtance, it will now be urged,—that as I do, and muſt admit, that the GENERAL HAPPINESS of the PEOPLE,

PLE, OUGHT to be the FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE of EVERY GOVERNMENT,—and that as I alſo allow, that there are DIFFERENT FORMS of government, SOME of which, are furniſhed with BETTER MEANS for that ONE GREAT END, than others;—"therefore,—the MAJORITY, MUST "at ALL TIMES, have a MORAL RIGHT "to change, (for inſtance) a conſtitution, "—which has intruſted an ARBITRARY "POWER, in the hands of ONE MAN,—"FOR ONE,—in which,—a power ſo lia-"ble to be abuſed,—is CONTROULED, "CHECKED, and REGULATED."

To prevent however, to the utmoſt of our power, ALL POSSIBLE ABUSE of the terms, "MORAL RIGHTS," by uſing them, without HAVING IDEAS ANNEXED TO THEM,—it is neceſſary to obſerve; that when they are applied to any *propoſed* ALTERATION, in the INTERNAL GOVERNMENT of a ſtate, the expreſſions,—MORALLY

RALLY RIGHT,—and POLITICALLY RIGHT are, SYNONYMOUS.

For, THAT change can not be MORALLY right, which is POLITICALLY WRONG; nor politically RIGHT, which is MORALLY WRONG. The GENERAL HAPPINESS, BEING, the ONLY COMMON MEASURE of any one, and the ſame change;—which, may be by ſome men, denoted in theſe different manners.—The WORDS therefore are only different,—but the SENSE of both the expreſſions, is the SAME.

For, ſhould any one deny this, and ſay, that it is very eaſy to *conceive*, MANY CHANGES in governments, which though undoubtedly MORALLY RIGHT, would be POLITICALLY WRONG:—if, we do but advance one ſtep further, and enquire, what is to be underſtood, by this *pretended diſtinction:* we ſhall find it to turn out, to be nothing more,—than *this quibble;*—that

ſome

ſome changes, may be conceived to be made in governments, which at CERTAIN TIMES, and under CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES, might be MORALLY RIGHT; which, at OTHER *certain times*, and under OTHER *certain circumſtances*,—would be,—POLITICALLY WRONG. But then, *ſtill* it will be found, that in THOSE SEASONS, and on THOSE OCCASIONS, WHEN they would be MORALLY, they *would* alſo, be POLITICALLY right; and on the contrary, and ſo always interchangeably, that at THOSE SEASONS, and upon THOSE OCCASIONS, that they *would* be POLITICALLY,—they *would* alſo be, MORALLY WRONG.

But in anſwer to the particular poſition juſt ſtated; it muſt be obſerved, that conſidering it, in the light, either of an UNIVERSAL OR GENERAL PPOPOSITION, no one can poſſibly be MORE FALSE; as evidently follows, from EVERY PROOF, which has been ALREADY ESTABLISHED.

But,

But, that *there* MAY *be* CASES SUPPOSED, in which, the people might lawfully change an arbitrary form of government, into a more limitted one, BECAUSE, there MAY BE CASES, where, ſuch an act, would be no infringement of any man's RIGHT, nor occaſion an *injury* to *any man*, —I am ready to grant.

Thus for inſtance, let us ſuppoſe a caſe, in which, a *tyrant*, by *death*, or *ſome other cauſe* of INCAPACITY, not only lets fall, but can never be able again, to reſume the reins of government; and that the conſtitution has not eſtabliſhed any ſettled rule of ſucceſſion. Here, the appointment of a ſucceſſor, being left dependent upon the choice of the people,—no doubt, the poſition is *ſo far true*, that in ſuch a caſe, the *electors may*,—becauſe, *no right* is infringed,—*change* the conſtitution.

For, the *government* is *then* for a *moment diſſolved;* and the multitude are returned to their *original ſtate of nature.* If then, they deſire again to live in a ſtate of CIVIL SOCIETY, and GOVERNMENT, which they *will* wiſh to do, if they have retained their ſenſes:—they certainly *may* either appoint another governor, with the *ſame* powers, as were intruſted to the *former*, only making choice of *one*, whom they deem to be a *wiſer*, and a *better* man;—or, by appointing *others*, either to ſome *participation* in his power, or indeed, by dividing the *whole* of it, either amongſt *ſome few*, or a GREAT MANY in number, hope, and endeavour to eſcape the evils which aroſe, as they think, from placing the *deſpotic* or *arbitrary power*, which MUST ALWAYS EXIST SOMEWHERE,—in the hands of ONLY ONE MAN.

In ſuch a caſe, no doubt the people do not do wrong, and may do right in attempting

attempting to *new-model* the government; becauſe, they *are* then, *preciſely* in the ſame ſituation, except having had the advantage of experience, in which, they were, —when they *at firſt* agreed to inſtitute a government. Though it muſt be obſerved, that even in this inſtance, the *innoxiouſneſs* of ſuch an attempt, is altogether limitted to thoſe caſes, where the new form can be modelled, without ANARCHY, and CONFUSION; and the CONSEQUENT CRIMES, which are attendant upon ſuch a ſtate. The PREVENTION of which, is the GRAND BLESSING of EVERY FORM of GOVERNMENT, and RENDERS the WORST, INFINITELY PREFERABLE, to NONE.

But in any OTHER caſe,—that is to ſay, —whilſt the government *actually exiſts*,— they can not for the reaſons, which I have aſſigned above, have any RIGHT,— but MUST DO WRONG, to DISSOLVE the government,—and revert to a ſtate of na-

ture, upon EVERY PRINCIPLE WHATSOEVER,—upon which,—either GOVERNMENT, or the LAWS of VIRTUE or MORALITY, CAN POSSIBLY BE FOUNDED. For, a majority, has NO MORE RIGHT, to TRANSGRESS ANY of THOSE LAWS, nor conſequently "TO DO EVIL THAT GOOD MAY "COME OF IT," than, *any* SINGLE INDIVIDUAL: But, in a ſtate of REBELLION, or of WAR,—it is CERTAIN that "EVIL "MUST be DONE,"—though it be quite UNCERTAIN, whether,—"ANY GOOD will "COME OF IT."

The *firſt method*, which I have aſſigned, in the foregoing caſe, which I have ſuppoſed,—from which,—the people may hope to have a *better* government, ariſe out of the aſhes of the former;—was moſt probably, the *firſt experiment*, which was tried. They reſolved to uſe, and probably did exerciſe the utmoſt care, caution, and circumſpection, as they thought, in the ſe-

lection

lection and choice of a *new* governor. But, such were the evils, which attended even *such* a *temporary*, though scarcely more than a *momentary* RELAPSE into a STATE of NATURE, and of ANARCHY, that repeated trials soon taught them,—that it was MUCH WORSE for mankind, to INCUR the CERTAIN EVIL, than even, to risk a *chance*, after the UNCERTAIN GOOD.

From further reflection and experience, they were no long time in learning,—that neither the MANY, nor EVEN the FEW, had WISDOM or VIRTUE enough, to raise the HIGHEST WISDOM, and the GREATEST VIRTUE, to the most exalted rank, and most extensive power.

From hence then, they concluded,—as they were well warranted by their knowledge of facts, and perfectly authorised by the conclusions of their reason, that an HEREDITARY SUCCESSION, was not only

best

beſt calculated for the avoidance of the miſeries, they had ſuſtained by ſo tumultous an election, but likewiſe, for the acquiſition of that good, at which they had aimed, by their ſolicitude in the CHOICE.

In *ſome* other caſes perhaps, though certainly in *much fewer*, men have ſeized the opportunity, which, the *diſſolution* of the government gave them, to adopt, *one*, or *other*, of the *other* METHODS I have mentioned; though EXPERIENCE, has CERTAINLY SHOWN, that it has, VERY SELDOM been attended with *much melioration*, of their *condition*. For, the ABSOLUTE POWER STILL EXISTS, though it be ever ſo much divided, and ſubdivided; and though therefore in theſe caſes, there muſt indeed be an UNION of WILLS, before it can bring OPPRESSION upon the PEOPLE, —yet, it frequently happens, (as there are always *motives* exiſting to *form* ſuch an union) that when formed, it wields an iron

iron rod of oppreſſion, ſo extenſive in length, and ſo deſtructive by it's weight; —that the hand of ONE *man*, could not even raiſe, much leſs, direct it.

But in moſt caſes, where, a CONSTITUTION has been formed, which AMPLY provides CHECKS, and CONTROULS, upon both the LEGISLATIVE, and EXECUTIVE POWERS of the government, for the production of the *greateſt poſſible general happineſs*;—it has rather been the effect, of what we *fooliſhly* call ACCIDENT, than of any SETTLED DESIGN, or REGULAR ADAPTATION of MEANS to ENDS.* Partly occaſioned by the ebullitions of men's paſſions, which at the time, no reaſon could juſtify, though even from them, good was afterwards educed; and when therefore, the firſt agents were criminal, though their actions,

* See my *Sermon* on the KING's RECOVERY.

actions were beneficial. And partly, by events, of which no human ſagacity could foreſee even their birth, and certainly much leſs, their conſequences.

To SUCH CAUSES, under the direction of heaven, do WE, for the moſt part owe, OUR OWN MOST EXCELLENT CONSTITUTION, the parts of which, are upon the WHOLE, ſo nicely balanced, and regularly adjuſted; that, the COMMUNITY has nothing to fear, from any UNCONTROULED TYRANNY of the EXECUTIVE POWER, though it is HEREDITARY, under CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS; nothing to dread,—from any unavoidable IGNORANCE, or rather CAPRICE, in the legiſlature;—nor any thing to tremble at, from the UNRULY PASSIONS, and LICENTIOUS WILLS of the PEOPLE. The *lower ranks* of *ſociety*, owe *their ſecurity*, to the *ſhare* intruſted to *numbers* of *them*, in the CHOICE of ONE of the CONSTITUENT PORTIONS of the LEGISLATURE;

LEGISLATURE; and the WHOLE SOCIETY is indebted for IT'S PRESERVATION, to the EXCLUSION of the MULTITUDE, from the POWER of MAKING LAWS, in themſelves; and the INTRUSTING SUFFICIENT FORCE in the EXECUTIVE POWER, to COMPEL THEM to OBEY thoſe, which are made by the perſons, in whom, that power is veſted;—whether, according to the people's OWN CONCEPTIONS of them, they HAPPEN, either to be APPROVED, or DISAPPROVED.

The more effectually however, to ſecure an attention in the legiſlature, to THE PEOPLE'S RIGHTS,—their INTEREST,—and their HAPPINESS;—they at ſtated intervals, have an OPPORTUNITY of REMOVING THOSE REPRESENTATIVES from their TRUST, who have given aſſent to laws, which, after the CONSTITUENTS have had TIME for COOL REFLECTION, they can not bring themſelves to like; and have

a RIGHT to CHOOSE others, who MAY, if THEY PLEASE, RESCIND theſe laws, diſliked by any of their electors. But, if a *majority* of the *new-elected* repreſentatives, do not agree to annul them, thoſe who ſhall *continue* to diſapprove the laws, are *as much* bound to *obey them*, as thoſe, from whom, they receive the MOST CORDIAL ASSENT.

THIS, is, a DUTY which ariſes, not only from the PARTICULAR FORM of THIS CONSTITUTION; but, from the GENERAL PRINCIPLE, COMMON to ALL governments. For though OUR CONSTITUTION, has indeed DEFINED, WHAT PERSONS are to CONSTITUTE the legiſlature, —the obedience which is due, to the MAJORITY of the TWO HOUSES, with the CONSENT of the KING, does not ariſe, either from the NATURE, or NUMBER of the perſons, conſtituting it;—but from the VERY CIRCUMSTANCE, of it's BEING the LEGISLATURE.

LEGISLATURE. For otherwiſe;—a MAJORITY of the WHOLE PEOPLE, either by their repreſentatives, or even in their own perſons, have NO MORE RIGHT, though they MAY have MORE POWER, to controul a *ſingle individual*;—than *any individual* has to CONTROUL ANOTHER. However EXCELLENT therefore, ſuch a conſtitution of the legiſlature may be, the OBEDIENCE DUE to it, *does* NOT ariſe FROM THAT EXCELLENCE;—but, becauſe, from the NATURE of ALL GOVERNMENTS, however DIFFERENT in their CONSTRUCTION, OBEDIENCE is UNIVERSALLY DUE to EVERY LEGISLATURE.

In SUCH a FORM of GOVERNMENT indeed, if, a law be propoſed, by *one* part of the legiſlature, the DUTY of the other TWO PARTS, is, *firſt* to enquire,—whether the *propoſed law* be CONSONANT with the CONSTITUTION, before they determine upon it's *expedience*. For to them, is in-

truſted the *preſervation* of EVERY PART of the CONSTITUTION; but NOT by any means to the PEOPLE at large;—any further,—than THEIR CHOICE of REPRESENTATIVES, has a TENDENCY, to *that* END. And, it is by ſo excellent a proviſion, (I mean) the *not* allowing any OTHER APPEAL to the people, than THIS, nor any appeal from them, but by *petitions*;—that, whilſt by theſe means,—a defence from OPPRESSION, is PROVIDED FOR THE PEOPLE;—STABILITY is SECURED to the GOVERNMENT.

For, whatever may be the authority, which advances the *contrary* opinion, and however often it may have been already, and may again hereafter be repeated,—that the PEOPLE of ENGLAND, have by the REVOLUTION, acquired,—the THREE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS of "*chooſing their own governors*," —of "*caſhiering them for miſconduct*,"—and, of "*framing a new government*;"—SUCH POSITIONS are as *falſe* in point of *fact*, as

as they are *repugnant* to every *juſt conception* of *ſound policy*:—if, by the *people* be meant,—the *general* BULK of the COMMUNITY; and if the aſſertors of this doctrine, DO NOT MEAN THIS,—and do not moſt benevolently intend to teach it, even to the very dregs of the people,—of which I dare to ſay, they never heard a word, till very lately,—they certainly mean NOTHING.

For the PEOPLE at large, had no interference whatſoever, in the SETTLEMENT made at that Æra;—NO APPEAL was made to them;—and their opinions were not ASKED. But, the REVOLUTION has indeed ESTABLISHED a PRINCIPLE, of the UTMOST IMPORTANCE, and of the HIGHEST conſequence. Which, however it may be diſputed by the FEW, or the MANY, appears to me, to be able to ſtand like a rock, unſhaken by all the buffetings of winds

winds and waves, amidſt the moſt tumultuous agitation of the ocean.

The PRINCIPLE, I mean, IS THIS. That, *when*, the EXECUTIVE POWER, which is the ONLY ONE, which can be EXTINCT, becomes ſo by INCAPACITY, ABDICATION, or FORFEITURE, in *conſequence* of *that* power, ACTING CONTRARY to the FUNDAMENTAL, and ESTABLISHED PRINCIPLES of the CONSTITUTION,—THEN,—in THAT CASE, the WHOLE POWER of the GOVERNMENT, DEVOLVES upon the TWO REMAINING BRANCHES of THE LEGISLATURE, SO FAR indeed, and NO FURTHER,—as to give THEM a RIGHT to SUPPLY the VACANCY, in that PARTICULAR CASE, by APPOINTING ANOTHER EXECUTIVE POWER, in as ſhort a time AS POSSIBLE, and in a MANNER, as conſentaneous with the USUAL MODE of SUCCESSION, as the PARTICULAR NATURE of the CASE, WILL ADMIT.

By

By this MOST EXCELLENT PROVISION, —the CONSTITUTION therefore, is SECURED againſt VIOLATION, from the exertion of any UNLAWFUL AUTHORITY, in the KING, which might either alter it, or convert it into an ABSOLUTE MONARCHY;—and it is likewiſe ſhielded from the interpoſition, of any LICENTIOUS EXERCISE in the PEOPLE,—which might either deſtroy it, by ANARCHY, or change it into a DEMOCRACY. But moreover, at the ſame time, that this *admirable proviſion*,—the eſtabliſhment of which,—we owe to the REVOLUTION,—*produces theſe ineſtimable benefits*, by guarding againſt both tyranny and licentiouſneſs,—it is itſelf, alſo prevented from even *verging* towards ABUSE, from another MOST IMPORTANT PRINCIPLE of the conſtitution; which, totally PROHIBITS and PREVENTS, the EXERCISE of any SUCH power, in the *ordinary* VACANCY of the throne by DEATH. For it DOES NOT even ADMIT of the IDEA, of

SUCH

SUCH a VACANCY;—but MAINTAINS,—that the KING NEVER DIES,—or,—in other words,—that, the THRONE IS NEVER VACANT, whilſt, an HEREDITARY SUCCESSOR, in a CERTAIN LINE EXISTS.

From theſe premiſes, then, it neceſſarily follows, that WHOEVER maintains, in *general* terms, that the PEOPLE have, in any SUCH CASES, the RIGHT of CASHIERING their governors, and of CHOOSING *other* governors,—and of FORMING what government they pleaſe,—muſt, upon this moſt important event, either manifeſt the GROSSEST DECEPTION, in the aſſertors themſelves.—or,—which,—I am ſure, I do not believe to have been the caſe,—betray in them, the MOST CRIMINAL INTENTION, to DECEIVE others.

SUCH is the PROVISION, which our admirable *conſtitution*, has framed to ſecure LIBERTY to the PEOPLE, and STABILITY to

to the GOVERNMENT. To which ends, the RIGHTS, which the PEOPLE POSSESS,—the POWERS which they EXERCISE,—the LIMITS, in which, they are CONFINED, and,—the OBLIGATION, by which,—they are BOUND to OBEY the LAWS,—are EQUALLY CONDUCIVE.

That under *ſuch* a *conſtitution*, men according to their different degrees of knowledge, and extent of their capacities, MAY OFTEN DIFFER IN OPINION, concerning the *tendency* of a law, as to the *general good* of the *governed*, or it's *conſiſtency* with the *principles* of our *particular form* of government,—can excite no ſurpriſe. But to hear it aſſerted,—as we often do,—that,—there can be *no good conſtitution* of government,—where,—the *people* themſelves *do not* give *their aſſent* to the laws, which they are bound to obey;—and,—to be almoſt deafened, by the ſounds of the NATURAL RIGHTS of men, which contain,

two incompatible ideas;—muſt neceſſarily aſtoniſh every man,—who does not YIELD to WORDS, inſtead of ARGUMENTS,—and, who does not miſtake, VULGAR OPINIONS, for DEMONSTRATED TRUTHS. For who, that has at all exerciſed his INTELLECT in inveſtigations, into the NATURE of MAN, but, muſt ſee, that *ſuch doctrines*, have not the *ſlighteſt* foundations to reſt upon, in HUMAN NATURE? And, can *ſuch* a man, though poſſeſſed of the greateſt candour,—deem the publiſhers, and diſſeminators of *ſuch opinions*, to be any other, than the moſt ſuperficial of readers, and the moſt unqualified of writers;—as men,—who content themſelves with the peruſal of treatiſes upon POLITICS, merely for the ſake of ſpouting in converſation, or, of manufacturing a book for the public;—as men,—who have aſſumed the taſk of teaching others, what they themſelves had never learned;—as men,—who might have read politics FOR AN AMUSEMENT,—but who had

had never received the aid of a ſingle ray of judgment, reaſoning, or thought, to guide them in their enquiry into it, AS A SCIENCE;—as men therefore,—guilty of the higheſt preſumption, conceit, and arrogance,—in DICTATING,—(whilſt, they were thus IGNORANT, of the VERY FIRST PRINCIPLES of LEGISLATION,)—LAWS to LEGISLATORS;—and laſtly as men,—*ſome of whom*, are chargeable, either with the moſt confirmed folly, or the higheſt criminality, for their ignorance, or contempt of the DUTY of SUBJECTS, by frequently uttering threats (if all their wiſhes be not gratified) of overthrowing;—and rejoicing by anticipation, in the deſtruction, of that government,—to which, they owe the greateſt gratitude for it's paſt indulgencies, and which is entitled, to their ſincereſt affection, and higheſt reverence, for the meekneſs and mildneſs, with which it bears their utmoſt virulence of abuſe,—upon every

part,—both of it's CIVIL, and ECCLESIASTICAL CONSTITUTION.

Thoſe likewiſe, who have REALLY STUDIED POLITICS AS A SCIENCE, muſt alſo be ſurpriſed, and aſtoniſhed at the abſurdity, which they every day ſee, of ſome men, who perhaps, would condemn *adoration* of GOD, as SUPERSTITION, and HOMAGE to the KING, as ſlavery; yet, boaſting of themſelves, and glorying in being the *mere echoes*, of ſome *few individuals*, or the bigotted tools of ſome party:—Of even others taking pride, and aſſuming conſequence to themſelves, from being enliſted under the banners of one or other of THOSE DIVISIONS, which are *not* denominated, by any appellation, which marks out any conformity with their ſentiments, or ſuitableneſs to their opinions;—but, only—by the *mean* and *contemptible terms* of *reproach*,—WHIGS and TORIES.

To

To every man, who at all reflects, on the NATURE of OUR CONSTITUTION; PRIDE or SELF-COMPLACENCY, or even SELF-APPROBATION, derived from such nominal distinctions as these, must appear to him, to be as perfectly ridiculous, as they would be in men, who were delighted with the appellation,—of MY LORD;—when it was only a *vulgar* NICKNAME given to them,—because,—they were *crook-backed.*

EACH of these parties, indeed boast, that THEY are the ONLY REAL PATRIOTS, and TRUE LOVERS of their country; and each on the contrary, CONDEMN their opponents, as it's very worst foes, and bittereſt enemies.

But, that not either of them is, more deserving of the former appellations, than the other, is clearly evident from this circumstance; that however *different* may be

be their colours,—yet, *both* are dreſſed in *liveries*, and both therefore exhibit the *badges* of their *ſlavery*.

For notwithſtanding, the vaunted, vaſt *redundance* of *modern light*, I muſt confeſs, I can *not ſee*, how any men can with juſtice, be called *true patriots and lovers* of *their country*, who are *not* ſincerely attached to IT'S LAWS, and the WHOLE of it's CONSTITUTION. Certainly therefore, THOSE can not merit thoſe titles, who from their predilections, for *different* and *oppoſite parts* of it, would *hazard*, the *deſtruction* of THE WHOLE. Conſequently likewiſe, therefore not THOSE, who in their parti-coloured clothes, are each eagerly watching oppoſite ſcales, that they may ſeize an opportunity of throwing an *additional* weight, into that of their favourite ſide; and by that means make it to preponderate. But it appears to me, that they only are entitled to thoſe moſt honourable

nourable appellations, who, being attached to *no party*, *really admire* the perfect æquilibrium of the present oppoſite weights; and watch with anxiety, leſt even the minuteſt thing; any, even the lighteſt particle of duſt, ſhould be thrown into either;—which, alone would be ſufficient, to give a partial inclination to either ſide, of ſo nicely a poliſhed beam, vibrating upon it's centre of motion, at the ſlighteſt touch.

But, perhaps it will be aſked;—how, the foregoing *opinions*, which have been ſhown to be *thus inconſiſtent* with REASON, and TRUE SCIENCE,—could poſſibly at any time, ſpring up in the world. And how more eſpecially, could they be ſo abundantly propagated, and cheriſhed in an *age*,—in which, numbers of writers, compliment their cotemporaries, and indeed it muſt be confeſſed, at the ſame time themſelves; by blazoning it forth, as the *wiſeſt*, and moſt *enlightened* age, which ever adorned

ed the annals of this nation, or even, ever illuminated this terreſtrial hemiſphere?

Fully, to give an anſwer to this queſtion, would require an accurate inveſtigation, of the *growth* and *progreſs* of literature in *this century*,—as connected,—with the *foregoing*. An inveſtigation, to which, if leiſure be allowed me, I may perhaps, *hereafter*, give ſome attention, as it has, no very diſtant connection, with, "AN EN-"QUIRY INTO THE IMPEDIMENTS TO HU-"MAN KNOWLEDGE." A ſubject which, *very* early in life engaged my enquiries, and which, for almoſt thirty years, has never ceaſed altogether to be, the object, of my inveſtigation.

But, to aſſign *ſome* of the *proximate* cauſes, is not at any time very difficult; and may now, perhaps, be attended with ſome benefit.

Firſt,

Firſt, then;—becauſe,—moſt of the governments of *Europe*, in which, *ſcience* flouriſhes, have been *monarchies*, and not *republics*.

Few *political* writers therefore, have conſidered the *various inconveniences*, which muſt neceſſarily be involved in *every plan* deviſed, and executed, by ſuch fallible creatures, as *men*; and ſome of which, though different in *kind*, muſt therefore appertain to *every* ſpecies of government. For this reaſon then, it was natural for politicians, more attentively to mark, and more accurately to deſcribe, the inconveniences produced by *that form* of government, under which they lived, and of which, they had actual experience, than thoſe evils, which, exiſting under conſtitutions, to which they were ſtrangers, could only be made known to them, by vague reports, and diſputable information. Hence then, it neceſſarily follows, from a principle common to the *ſen-*

ſes, the *imagination*, and the *intellect*;—that the one ſet of objects, becauſe near, would appear enlarged beyond their real dimenſions; and the others would be repreſented, as diminiſhed even to miniatures. A line therefore, in the ſecond ſatire of Horace, will inform us, why under theſe circumſtances, men would *haſtily* wiſh to live in a ſtate, which really approaches in the next degree, to NO GOVERNMENT at all; rather, than to remain the ſubjects of a government, which may be claſſed under any SPECIES of MONARCHY. The line begins,—*Dum vitant*, &c.—But,—VERBUM; SAT SAPIENTI.

Secondly, becauſe,—in early youth, all our ideas of LIBERTY, are ſo aſſociated with the *republican form* of government; and we are then ſo captivated, with the gay and gaudy colours of the eloquence, with which they are tinted;—that,—even,

—when

—when we are MEN, we are not *willing* to reflect, upon the evils, which, they produced; and of which, a very ſlight attention to the faithful records of hiſtory, would give us a full, but melancholy conviction.

For, if we mark with any obſervation, the hiſtory of the REPUBLIC of ATHENS, we ſhall find,—that the adjudications of the people, were, for the moſt part, denunciations of vengeance, againſt thoſe great men, who had rendered the moſt eſſential ſervices to the ſtate; and who by their *wiſdom*, and *virtue*, reflect the higheſt honour upon themſelves, and their country.

So likewiſe, if we recollect, the riſe, the progreſs, and declenſion of the people of ROME;—we ſhall diſcover,—that, having been faſcinated, by the *external* ſplendor of the ſtate, during the times of the republic; we had forgotten the perpetual, *in-*

ternal diſſenſions, by which it was conſtantly agitated. And, ſtruck with horror, at ſome particularly flagrant acts of wickedneſs, committed by ſome of thoſe wretches, who, though ROMAN EMPERORS, were the vileſt of the human ſpecies,—and *blots* on human nature;—that we had buried in oblivion,—the contentions,—wars,—proſcriptions,—and maſſacres,—which, though more horrible in their effects, and more extenſive in their operations, were perpetrated, during the continuance of the ſtate, under the FORM of a REPUBLIC.

Thirdly, becauſe, though the TRUE DOCTRINE, of the UNIVERSAL DUTY OF SUBJECTS TO OBEY THEIR GOVERNORS, has been frequently maintained; yet,—it was upon WRONG PRINCIPLES only, that it has been hitherto defended.

For, nothing is more common, in the progreſſions of ſcience, than to behold,

TRUE

TRUE OPINIONS *admitted* in *one age*,—though ſupported by BAD ARGUMENTS;—and the *ſame true opinions*, *rejected* in the NEXT, *only becauſe*, they had not *before* been founded upon *juſt principles*. And on the contrary, it is not leſs frequent, to ſee *opinions*, received, from the ſuppoſed *ſtrength* of the proofs, by which, they are propped;—when,—upon a *further* examination, —THOSE VERY OPINIONS, are not only diſcovered by *other* arguments to be FALSE in THEMSELVES; but, the *proofs* alſo, which had been applied to them, are found, to be ſo exceedingly weak, as to be totally incapable, of ſuſtaining the weight, they had been provided, to ſupport.

Fourthly, becauſe, in this nation, the arguments in defence of the *concluſions*, I have deduced, were before not only, NOT taken from the FIRST PRINCIPLES, which I have now drawn FRESH, I truſt, from the WELL of TRUTH, and from which, as

a GENERAL SOURCE,—ALL *governments*, I have ſhown, originally flow. But *thoſe principles* which had been produced by others, were not only extremely impure in themſelves, but were likewiſe rendered *putrid*, by a mixture of certain *phlogiſtic* ideas, of the *nature* of government in GENERAL, and of *our* OWN CONSTITUTION in PARTICULAR;—ſuch as the JUS DIVINUM, and HEREDITARY INDEFEASIBLE RIGHTS of KINGS, &c. Evident however as this is, —numbers perhaps, enveloped as they are in *prejudices*, will obſtinately REJECT MINE too, AS UNWHOLESOME,—without employing even either their eyes, or their taſte, in the ATTEMPT TO DISCOVER, how totally *they* differ from thoſe, which they have formerly reprobated, and long ſince regorged.

Fifthly, becauſe, even, the PRINCIPLES of the REVOLUTION, have been by many, if not by moſt men, totally miſunderſtood. For

For *that event*, has been generally imagined, if not univerſally believed, to have *ſprung* from the RIGHTS, COMMON TO ALL MANKIND; under EVERY SPECIES, and FORM of government. From this miſtake therefore, Sir, of your *maſter*, Mr. Locke, and your other teachers, who were *firſt his pupils*, *that event*, has been repeatedly cited, and reiteratedly boaſted of, not only as a LESSON, but alſo an EXAMPLE of INSTRUCTION, to ALL OTHER NATIONS. It having been conſtantly pointed out to *other* ſtates, as an object of IMITATION, for the conduct, THEY OUGHT to purſue, whenever the emotions of the governed, ſhall be in diſcord, with the ſentiments of the governors. Whereas, in reality,—the PRINCIPLES of the *revolution*, were only a GLORIOUS MANIFESTATION, of the PARTICULAR RIGHTS of BRITONS: (ſo far as I have above explained THEM to extend)—IMPARTED, by the LAWS,—

and

and ſtrengthened by the PECULIAR FRAME, —of the ENGLISH CONSTITUTION.

Sixthly, there were, TWO OTHER CAUSES, which occaſioned a very ready admiſſion, and general reception to the doctrines, oppoſite to thoſe, which I have been introducing, and ſupporting. *Theſe are*, the almoſt univerſal paſſions, of PRIDE and AMBITION; though the one, is ſometimes cloathed, even in the plain garb of humility, and the other, often retires far diſtant, from courts and palaces.

For, as I have before obſerved, the VERY SAME PASSIONS,—which,—PROMPT men,—*when*, in POWER,—to become TYRANTS;—INSTIGATE likewiſe the SAME, or OTHER MEN,—*when*,—OUT OF POWER, —to turn REBELS.

It is evident therefore, that from the prevalence of theſe two paſſions, NO DOC-

TRINES

TRINES could be more acceptable, to the MAJORITY of mankind, than the notions, with which, LOCKE, and *other writers* upon government, have flattered them;—I mean,—in reſpect to their PERFECT ORIGINAL EQUALITY with *thoſe*, who are now by their rank *elevated* above, and by their power, are placed in *authority* over them. This poſition, muſt in itſelf alone, have afforded them great ſatisfaction. But, the INFERENCE, which, they could not fail to draw from the premiſes,—prompted as they were, by the paſſions of human nature,—muſt have imparted to them, a ſtill greater pleaſure. For the deduction from hence, was ſo obvious, that they could not poſſibly overlook it, eſpecially, when inſtigated by *pride* and *ambition*; and therefore they immediately, and indeed, ſuppoſing the truth of the poſition, —very juſtly inferred,—that the only *proper reform* in ALL governments,—IS,—to RESTORE that PRISTINE ſtate of things,—

either altogether, or at leaſt ſo far,—as THEIR OWN CLASSES ARE CONCERNED, and all others are affected, who hold thoſe political tenets; which, whoever can repeat by *rote*, is deemed to be, as compleat in ALL WISDOM, as even the STOICS WISE MAN; and as SUPEREMINENT in GOODNESS, as that CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHER,—who, *Pope* ſays,—was poſſeſſed, of "*every virtue under heaven.*"

From theſe notions however, it muſt be confeſſed, there ariſes ſuch an idea of their own *ſelf-importance*, and *dignity* of *character* in adopting them, and ſuch a full blown conceit, of their own SUPERIOR WISDOM, and of their own UNPARALLELED VIRTUE in maintaining them; —that the flame of ambition, ſometimes breaks forth into open view: And theſe philoſophers, as they boaſt themſelves to be,—can not ſometimes forbear, even in defiance of prudence, to BETRAY their

EXPECTATION,

EXPECTATION,—that notwithſtanding, they may at *firſt* endeavour to RAISE:—They HOPE however, SOON AGAIN to DISPERSE, this *rain-bowed—coloured bubble,* of EQUALITY.

For, conſtant experience teaches us, that there is not ANY CLASS of men, who, under the *preſent* exiſting governments, are ſo tenacious of their *real* rank, as theſe ADVOCATES for EQUALITY, are of their *fancied* one; which in their own eſtimation, they not only appreciate as due to their worth; but which, they on all occaſions, with no little anxiety to themſelves, and inconvenience to others, aſſume; —contrary to all the rules of law,—cuſtom, — preſcription, — courteſy,—and good manners. THEY, truly,—*diſdain* to ſhow any reſpect to TITLES;—they pay their homage,—only to MERIT; and being in *their own* opinion, poſſeſſed of a *monopoly* of all the WISDOM, and VIRTUE in the world, they very eaſily conclude, that

THEY are THEMSELVES ALONE, ENTITLED to the very HIGHEST RANK. So incautious are they from confidence, or ſo ignorant are they of mankind, as to imagine; —that other men, will believe them to be the SINCERE advocates, for an EQUALITY of CONDITIONS; becauſe,—they ſhow that they HATE *that* rank and power in *others*, which, *they do not themſelves* POSSESS; though whatever privilege or *authority*, they *may happen* TO HAVE, they convert into *tyranny* over thoſe, who *have* it *not*.

If therefore, by ſtepping forth as *pretended champions*, for an *equality* of ranks, they could *really overturn*, the preſent eſtabliſhed ſyſtems of government;—with all the raſh inexperience of PHAETON, they fancy,—they ſhould ſoon ſeat themſelves in the chariot, and direct the horſes of the ſun;—and with all *his* blind confidence, they imagine, they ſhould then glorioufly illuminate, the whole ſyſtem of the world.

Though

Though better would it be for *them now*, as it would *before* have been likewiſe, for their *kindred-minded philoſophers* in FRANCE, —to be *warned*,—rather by *his example*;— than fired by his *ambition*. Leſt it ſhould be thought neceſſary, that *they*, like *him*,— ſhould be deſtroyed by lightning;—as the only reſource left,—for the preſervation of all the other regions of the earth, from a general conflagration.

I muſt however, do theſe gentlemen the *juſtice* to confeſs, that there is *another conſequence* of the paſſions, which, are the *cauſes*, of their blind credulity, in the *belief* of their political doctrines,—their pertinacious bigotry in the aſſertion of them,—and their rooted antipathy to all who oppoſe them, —which they have never diſcerned, and of which, therefore, they are totally unconſcious.

For

For it is evident, that exactly in proportion as *such doctrines*, are adapted, to *gratify* the paſſions I have juſt mentioned, —they muſt in the generality of mankind, —neceſſarily *excite emotions* of *pleaſure* and *delight.*

But however, well acquainted theſe *profound politicians*, may be, with the analyſis of the particles of bodies;—yet, as they are perfectly unpracticed, in the analyſation of the ſentiments of the mind;—and but very little accuſtomed, even to the PERCEPTION of TRUTH;—they muſt therefore, neceſſarily MISTAKE in *this* inſtance, which the *unreflecting multitude* do in *all* caſes,—the PLEASURABLE EBULLITIONS ariſing, from the PASSIONS,—for,—the INTELLECTUAL EMOTIONS, which in reality, belong only, to the DEMONSTRATION of SCIENCE.

And, hence it is, that we ſo often hear them, vaunting of their RATIONAL NOTIONS,

ONS, and LIBERAL OPINIONS;—whilſt they themſelves, are totally ignorant of their *true origin*, and *real ſource*.—For, it is evident, that, *the former epithet*, can not, by any means, belong to *their* notions or their opinions,—as ariſing, from a *deep* enquiry into the FIRST PRINCIPLES,—and an *accurate* examination of the PRIMARY DEFINITION,—upon which,—they are founded; and from which, they are deduced, by a nice and accurate concatenation of proofs; —which,—is the ONLY PROCESS,—by which,—ANY *notions*, can poſſibly have a *legitimate* claim, to the *title* of RATIONAL. This is manifeſt, from this plain and well known fact, that at the very moment, they are boaſting of their *ſuperior* powers of *reaſoning*, they are almoſt always betraying the lamentable poverty, and miſerable emptineſs, of their argumentative ſtores. As indeed, almoſt every *ſingle page*, of *theſe letters*, *ſufficiently proves*.

So

So likewiſe, in reference to the LIBERALITY, of their notions or opinions, it is *equally manifeſt*, that they can not ſet up their claim to *this* title, from *their liberality* of ſentiments, towards thoſe, who differ from them. Nor, from *their freedom* from *prejudices*, either *againſt other* men's opinions, or in *favour of their own*. Becauſe, whilſt they are in the very act of boaſting, of the *liberality* of *their* own ſentiments, they are frequently, at the very inſtant, ſo *groſsly abuſing*, that CIVIL and RELIGIOUS ESTABLISHMENT, to which, they are themſelves indebted, for *toleration* and *protection;* ſo as to leave us totally at a loſs to determine, which, is the moſt wonderful;—the FORBEARANCE of the one party, or the INGRATITUDE of the other. In one reſpect however, the conduct of the latter, is perfectly conſiſtent, and their aſſertions are equally true. For, whilſt they repreſent the doctrines of their opponents, as ſo *abhorrent* from REASON, and COM-

MON

MON SENSE, that they need NO REFUTATION; they COMMAND the world, upon their IPSE DIXIT, to BELIEVE; that *their* OWN OPINIONS, are ſo SELF-EVIDENT, as to REQUIRE NO ARGUMENT, for *their ſupport.*

Theſe are facts, which have likewiſe been in no ſmall degree apparent, in the courſe of THESE LETTERS; but the reader can only ſee them in their brighteſt colours, and their really gigantic dimenſions, by a careful inſpection, of theſe authors OWN WRITINGS.

Theſe circumſtances, then, afford *another proof*, of the truth of my foregoing poſition,—that,—the CAUSES of their other erroneous opinions, and of their fancied ſuperiority, in *rational* and *liberal* notions, can only, really originate from the operations,—though as I am ready to allow, unperceived by themſelves,—of pride, va-

nity, and ambition. And indeed, I am extremely glad, that TRUTH warrants this concluſion. For I would much rather, impute their miſtakes to a *neglected education*, than to any *original inferiority*, in their underſtandings.

Impelled therefore, by theſe emotions, or paſſions, moſt gladly, would they aſſume the government, of *all* the kingdoms of the earth. But as unfortunately for them, not even the empire over *one* of them, *as*, they are *now conſtituted*, is *likely* to fall to their ſhare;—the *next degree* of *pleaſure*, which they can receive;—is,—from STRIPPING *governors*, as much as they can, of all *power* of *controul* over THEM, AS SUBJECTS. For, *this* they know, would not only in the *next* degree, beſt gratify their inclinations, but may perhaps, —they think,—pave the way in time,—to *their own* acquiſiton of power, and authority;—and therefore, they term all theſe levelling

levelling principles, not only the *moſt*, but the *only* RATIONAL NOTIONS of government.

Of the EFFECTS of ſuch principles, we may ſee the PROOFS in the *philoſophers* in FRANCE, who loudly alſo pleaded, for an EQUALITY of conditions.—But who likewiſe we find, by no means, intended to *humble themſelves*, to the rank of thoſe, who were *before* in the claſſes *below* THEM;—and thus by ſharing, to alleviate *their* burthens.—No far from it.—For *this* they knew, would be to imbibe the *true ſpirit*, of that *deteſtable ſuperſtition*,—as they term it, which others call CHRISTIANITY. But, in conformity with the *more enlightening inſpiration* of PHILOSOPHY; they as ſoon as poſſible, hurled from their ſeats,—ALL THOSE,—who had been *before* elevated *above* THEM,—that they might partake, of the plunder of their power, and their wealth;—and thus, have forced themſelves,

—for a time at leaſt, by *art*,—into a height,—far above *that* LEVEL,—to which, by the properties, given to them by nature, they are fitted to riſe; and to which, they muſt again by the laws of gravity, ſoon, once more ſink.

So alſo, in reſpect to their *religious* opinions. Finding that they have *no* probability at preſent, of *eſtabliſhing their own*; —as the *next* ſtep, which would be moſt acceptable to them, they endeavour to perſuade the world, that the TRUTH or NATURE of any *particular* religion, or, the ſentiments of it's *various ſects*, have not the REMOTEST CONNECTION, with the HAPPINESS of the STATE; and that, as *religion*, is of NO USE in CONDUCING to CIVIL HAPPINESS; it OUGHT to have no kind of INFLUENCE upon it, whatſoever. And conſequently therefore, that the LEGISLATURE has NO RIGHT to INTERMEDDLE in it's concerns, nor even to

THINK

THINK of any means, which may conduce to it's ESTABLISHMENT, or PROPAGATION.

From hence then, it follows, in their opinion; that,—NO MAN'S NOTIONS or ACTIONS, are REALLY LIBERAL, who treat,—with the *utmoſt candour*, *mildneſs*, *forbearance*, and *brotherly charity*,—ALL who *differ* from *him ever ſo much*, in RELIGIOUS SENTIMENTS;—but, that HE is the *only truly liberal man*, who, with the *utmoſt violence*, *virulence*, and even ungentlemanlike licentiouſneſs, vilifies ALL, who, *will not* MAINTAIN with THEM,—that men's *notions* of religion, are matters of PERFECT INDIFFERENCE, to the WELFARE of SOCIETY.

The CONSEQUENCES, which NECESSARILY follow, from theſe brilliant ideas of *rationality* and *liberality*, if *rightly* drawn out to their CONCLUSIONS;—are evident-

ly

ly the following, which, whilſt theſe writers are *out* of *power* themſelves, they wiſh to ſee eſtabliſhed.

Firſt. That, the moſt RATIONAL and LIBERAL government, *is that*, in which *each* man, is *ſolely his own governor*;—or in other words,—THAT STATE, is the BEST GOVERNED, WHICH HAS NO GOVERNMENT.

Secondly. That the MOST RATIONAL and LIBERAL of ALL RELIGIONS,—*is that*,—which admits of of the MOST INDIFFERENCE to it's PRECEPTS; and has LEAST INFLUENCE upon *men*, *as* MEMBERS of *ſociety*; —or in other words,—that a RELIGION, is *then* MOST BENEFICIAL TO A STATE, when, it HAS LEAST INFLUENCE.

ANOTHER CAUSE—of the *prevalence* of *ſuch* doctrines, is,—becauſe, in reality, the TRUE CHARACTERISTICS of the

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION of this VERY ENLIGHTENED EIGHTEENTH CENTURY,—are NOT what theſe writers ſuppoſe,—and what, for the gratification of their own vanity,—they wiſh others to believe.—But on the contrary, they conſiſt in *fact*,—in the ENORMOUS NUMBER of it's VORACIOUS READERS;—in the great ABUNDANCE of it's MULTIFARIOUS WRITERS;—and in the MULTITUDE of it's FLUENT SPEAKERS. And, at the ſame time alſo,—in it's WOEFUL PAUCITY of DEEP THINKERS;—SAGACIOUS INVESTIGATORS;—and ORIGINAL GENIUSES. Theſe are clearly evidenced by it's boldneſs, and confidence in ASSERTION, it's weakneſs and incapacity in ARGUMENT. It's preſumption and conceit, in ſuppoſing itſelf to be irradiated with the brighteſt light, when at the ſame time, even a very weak one, is too ſtrong for it's very feeble optics.

For

For in proportion, as the acquiſition of OPINIONS, has been facilitated, the attainment of KNOWLEDGE, has been diminiſhed. As men, have had *more volumes* TO READ, they have devoted a *leſs portion of their time* to STUDY. As BOOKS, have increaſed in NUMBERS, REASONING has decreaſed in ACUTENESS. And of all the phænomena, which this age has exhibited, in the regions of literature;—TWO will appear the MOST REMARKABLE, and WONDERFUL to future times; if there ſhould ariſe an able and impartial critic, to trace the *riſe*, *progreſs*, and *declenſion* of IT'S OPINIONS.

Firſt. That thoſe authors,—who WROTE the MOST,—THOUGHT the LEAST.

Secondly. That thoſe, who made the *loudeſt claims* to the GREATEST RATIONALITY, or to the HIGHEST POWERS of REASONING; were the LEAST ELEVATED above

above others, by *this* CHARACTERISTIC of man; and muſt, in the next century,—for the *very ſhort* time,—that any obſcure veſtige of their memory, ſhall be traced,—be ranked amongſt ſome of the *lower claſſes*, of the *worſt reaſoners*, of *any* age.

So well founded, do theſe poſitions appear to me, that I dare, *here*, to make the appeal to the *judgment* of POSTERITY; and even to call for your own writings, Sir, to be the evidence produced, upon which, the ſentence of acquittal, or condemnation, ſhould be paſſed.

When however, I am appreciating the literature of the age, I hope, I ſhall not be underſtood, as ſpeaking of the *whole* Iſland of Great-Britain; but only of this *ſouthern* part of it. For I have before acknowledged, in reſpect to our united brethren in the north, without aſſuming

the arduous office of a reviewer, in determining upon the *truth*, or *falſehood* of their opinions;—that we certainly *there* find writers, poſſeſſed of DEEP THOUGHT, CLOSE INVESTIGATION, and BRILLIANT POWERS. Nor, when confined even within *theſe* bounds, do I hope, to be underſtood, as meaning to characteriſe the WHOLE of *this century*. For certainly, *conſidered* as an WHOLE; *it* will ſtand VERY HIGH in the annals of fame. Nor likewiſe, would I be underſtood, to include *all* the authors, who now write towards it's cloſe. For the name, of *Mr. Burke* can not fail, to occur to every one's recollection; and no one indeed, can be ſo ignorant, as not to know, that there are likewiſe ſeveral other very ingenious writers, now living; though it would be an invidious, and odious taſk in an individual, to enumerate their names. Men, who,—notwithſtanding the diſcouragements *they* have received, and every man of

of real genius, muſt receive, from partial criticiſm at preſent;—will, from their various purſuits, be ranked in *future times*, amongſt ſome of the *bright* ornaments, of the literature of this country.

But, my intention is only, *more particularly* to *characteriſe* THOSE;—who,—by forming themſelves into parties, and uniting into cabals,—ſtrengthen their own confidence in themſelves, and by mutual puffing each other, are ſo inflated with inflammable air, as to imagine, that they are able to ſoar like balloons, to the ſublimeſt heights. And as the *vulgar*, whether, they be called the learned, or are truly denominated the unlearned, always miſtake *aſſertions* for *proofs*, they readily give credit to *their own accounts* of *each other*, and hence, they become the writers, who are at *preſent*, the moſt heard of,—moſt talked of,—moſt quoted,—and moſt flattered.

It is from ſuch inſtances only, I mean to *infer*, that the *concluſion* of this century, does *not* ſurpaſs the *foregoing*, nor by any means, *equal* it's own commencement. For, though many more as I have already ſaid, are certainly now become readers, and writers, than there were formerly;—yet,—as they are not on *that* account, DEEPER THINKERS, and BETTER REASONERS,—the POPULARITY of any OPINION, can be NO PROOF of it's TRUTH.

There is indeed, one melancholy inſtance of neglected learning and ability, which will juſtly brand this age, with the ſevere cenſure of poſterity; and of which, numbers muſt partake, who are not circumſcribed within that narrow circle, of which I have juſt now, been drawing a deſcription. I mean, FLOYER SYDENHAM: That moſt learned tranſlator, and moſt philoſophical annotator, upon *ſome* of the *dialogues*, of the

the *illuſtrious Plato*. But, ſo little was the *taſte* of the age ſuited, either to the invaluable works of the author, or the incomparable notes of the tranſlator, that the latter I underſtand,—died, on account of debt, in a common jail; WHO,—in any *former* age, in which, ALL MEN HIGH IN OFFICE, eſteemed it their own higheſt honour, to patronize *genius* and *learning*,—would have acquired, what he was juſtly entitled to,—both, *wealth* and *honours*.

In ALL the LIBERAL and MECHANIC ARTS, there can be no doubt, but that this age *far* outſhines any, which Britain has ever ſeen. In painting in particular, the genius of a REYNOLDS alone, darting it's rays, both from his *works*, and his *diſcourſes*, diffuſes a luſtre around it's cloſe, far brighter than the meridian ſplendour of any former century.

In

In *electricity*, *magnetiſm*, *chemiſtry*, *&c.* it certainly has to boaſt, a large collection of *facts*, eſtabliſhed upon well-inſtitued *experiments*: which, may perhaps ſupply another *Newton*, with many materials for a future ſyſtem. And ſo far, Sir, as you have had your ſhare, in contributing, to the collection

——— *Sume Superbiam*
Quæſitam meritis.

Laſtly, then;—for *this*, follows as a *conſequence* from the *preceding* reaſon; many mere momentary meteors, are in the literary hemiſphere at preſent, miſtaken for planets,—and planets for fixed ſtars. Conſequently therefore, the *maſs* of the *people*, conceiving the rays, which are merely reflected from the *moon*, to be the *direct* beams iſſuing from the *ſun*;—they are incapable of diſtinguiſhing, the ſhades of bodies

bodies from their outlines, and miſtake what are only ſhadows, for real objects.

Thus, Sir, (to borrow your well-known metaphor) I have now layed, and ſet fire to a train, which has entirely blown up, ONE of your PRINCIPAL FORTS, from it's very foundations: and which has likewiſe, *already undermined* the OTHER: Though towards *that*,—*this* train, was not indeed, immediately directed, in a ſtrait line. As to any muſquetry, therefore, which you may have drawn up around you, as a guard to your own perſon; *theſe*, even your prudence and compaſſion ſhould have ſpared; inſtead of betraying your own imbecility, by expoſing thoſe, to certain deſtruction, who are both too weak to reſiſt an adverſary, and too feeble to annoy him.

The firing a volley at THEM, can only be conſidered, as *a feu de joie*, after the victory.

victory. For, their powder, has, during the ſiege, loſt all it's force, if it ever had any; and even the locks of their muſquets, which were at firſt, extremely weak and ill conſtructed, are moſt of them now,—even ſhattered into pieces.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

LETTER

LETTER X.

SIR,

WHEN inſtead of advancing, I reſt upon my arms, and look back, upon the deveſtation, and demolition, which the irreſiſtible force of my battery has produced,—and ſee numbers, already weeping over the ſcattered fragments, and deſolated ruins of your *principal fort*;—PITY, prompts in me the wiſh, to ſlacken my career, and even to deſiſt, from further triumph. It urges me, to refrain from adding, to the number of the conquered,

and to ſpare the weakneſs, of the few of your forces, which ſtill remain.

But, when it occurs to my recollection, that to a *ſoldier*,—CONTEMPT, is WORSE than DEATH;—it ſeems to me, moſt probable,—that the ſame ſentiments are entertained by all, who are engaged in any other ſpecies of POLEMICKS; and then, even compaſſion teaches me, that it is more merciful to kill, than to ſave.

As therefore, you have arranged in ſome order, ſome few of your rank and file, which are ſtill left: I ſhall employ a few minutes more, in advancing againſt *them*. For though it is true, that none of them, were firſt inliſted, and trained by *you*, but, are only ſome infirm, old troops, whom you picked up, from other generals, I ſhall now preſent them, with a few vollies of ſmall arms; leſt, *weak* as they are, they ſhould, as I have ſaid, deem the paſſing them

them by unnoticed, as a greater diſgrace, and which conſequently, they would be much leſs willing to ſuſtain, than to be covered with wounds, or left dead in the field.

I ſhall therefore hold no further parley, but immediately proceed to diſperſe, the feeble body, of light-armed troops, which you have ſtationed, in the *third letter*, *page* 22.

The *firſt* poſition you have taken, is this,—"that the REVOLUTION in this coun-"try, is an EVENT, which, *more* than *any* "*thing* elſe, has *opened* the eyes of Eng-"liſhmen, to the *true principles* of *govern-*"*ment.*

Now, Sir, by thoſe, to *whom*, the revolution ſerved in your opinion, as a ſubſtitute for the operation of couching, I conclude, that you muſt moſt aſſuredly mean

yourſelf, and your friends. For you certainly will not allow, that *any others*, *do underſtand* the *true principles*, of government. But, as I have already, I do not ſcruple to ſay, DEMONSTRATED, that *they* are the *very perſons*, who have more *particularly* MISUNDERSTOOD, the *true principles* of that EVENT, as well as, THE FIRST *principles of* ALL GOVERNMENT; it follows, —that in this caſe,—"the *blind are* led "by the *blind;*"—and if therefore, they have had their eyes opened at all,—it can have really ſerved to no other purpoſe,—than to make, their,—"*darkneſs viſible.*"—But, as I have now in this work, erected, and lighted up ſo many beacons, for our guidance and ſecurity, I do not entertain the ſlighteſt apprehenſion,—for the *laſting peace*, *proſperity*, and *happineſs*, of *theſe* kingdoms; nor feel the leaſt atom of fear, leſt this adumbration,—in which,—you and your friends are enveloped,—ſhould ever degenerate into ſuch a plague,—as that of Egypt;

Egypt;—ſo that the DARKNESS, ſhould not only, be "SEEN,"—but alſo,—be even,—"FELT."

That "*the great object of all government,* "*is, the* PUBLIC GOOD,—is certainly ONE of thoſe undeniable truths, which ſprings, from the very origin of *all* government. This I have already aſſerted, and did always as readily allow;—upon the CONVICTION of REASON; as *you* can poſſibly have admitted it, upon your principles of AVOWED BIGOTRY, to Mr. LOCKE. But at the ſame time, I have alſo ſhown, that the *deductions*, which HE has drawn from it, and which YOU, as the ſhadow following the ſubſtance, likewiſe repreſent, are, in *direct oppoſition* to REASON.

For, you maintain, "*that from* THIS "*principle, it follows, that all magiſtrates are* "ANSWERABLE *to the* PEOPLE, *for their* "*conduct in office, and* REMOVABLE *at* THEIR "PLEASURE,

" PLEASURE, *and that the* RIGHT *of* RESIST-
" ING *an oppreſſive government,* THAT IS,
" SUCH, AS THE PEOPLE SHALL DEEM TO BE
" OPPRESSIVE, MUST BE HELD SACRED."

Now, Sir, THESE PREMISES, and CONCLUSIONS, appear to me, to be much farther diſtant from each other, than even your reſidence at *Birmingham*, from mine at *Great Yarmouth*. And, as you have not been ſo kind, as to erect any of thoſe *direction-poſts*, called REASONS, or ARGUMENTS, to point us out the road, from the one, to the other; I ſhould no more expect, to ſet out from the *premiſes*, and arrive by a *ſtrait line* at the *concluſion*, without wandering in ſcepticiſm, or plunging into the abyſs of error; than, to ſet out from the *latter town*, and by the *ſame means* to reach the former, without being drowned in a river, or foundered in a bog.

Beſides,

Beſides, in the *one* caſe, I have already ſhown;—that the road is *totally obſtructed*, by an *inacceſſible*, and *unpaſſable* mountain; which, entirely blocks up the paſſage. Becauſe, from the very NATURE of ALL GOVERNMENT, it follows,—or rather,—the very *word*,—GOVERNMENT,—in itſelf,—IMPLIES,—that the GOVERNORS *of a ſtate*,—are to RULE the GOVERNED;—NOT the GOVERNED, *to* RULE THE GOVERNORS.

Therefore, Sir, though *you* have been pleaſed to *obſerve*, in the ſame leaf, and no doubt *believe*,—that the "*public good*, "being the moſt NATURAL and RATIONAL "of *all rules*; and what, is MUCH MORE "EASY to DETERMINE, than either, what, "—GOD HAS ORDAINED,—or,—what ANTIQUITY AUTHORISES;" *true*, and *ſelf-evident*, as ſuch poſitions may be to you, and conſequently, that legiſlation is the EASIEST of all taſks:—Yet, *that truth* and *ſelf-evidence*, *muſt be totally undiſcernible by me*,—

me,—*'till* you have PROVED;—that the RIGHT of the PEOPLE,—is, to have the COMMAND OVER GOVERNORS; and the DUTY of GOVERNORS, is, to pay OBEDIENCE to the PEOPLE; and alſo, that the MOST ILLITERATE of MANKIND, CAN MUCH EASIER DISCOVER, WHAT CONDUCES TO THE PUBLIC GOOD;—THAN GOD, CAN REVEAL IT.

In page 24, you tell us, "that men "ſurely can not be ſaid to *give up* their "*natural rights*, by entering into a com- "pact for the better *ſecuring* of them." By which, NATURAL RIGHTS, you tell us, you mean, LIFE, LIBERTY, and PROPERTY.

This propoſition indeed, Sir, would be moſt certainly, not only *ſelf-evident*, but even *identical*; did it not, a little unfortunately TAKE for GRANTED, that there ARE SUCH THINGS, as NATURAL RIGHTS.

Now,

Now, on account of this unlucky accident, you muſt be under the unavoidable neceſſity, not only of *undertaking* a taſk, but alſo of *accompliſhing* an exploit,—which,—I am afraid, is infinitely leſs ſuited to the ſtrength of your mind, than the *hardeſt* labour,—or even *all* the labours of *Hercules* were, to the *vigour* of his body.

For, before this poſition, can poſſibly be admitted,—which indeed, you hold in common with your ſchool-maſters, though to you alone belong, the unparticipated honour of ſo clear, ſo accurate, and ſo very ſenſible a ſtatement of it;—you muſt firſt DESTROY not only, the WHOLE CONCATENATION, but likewiſe, every *individual link* in the *chain*, of THAT REASONING,—which *holds*,—and *binds* together, the *foregoing letters*. But, as this is ſo arduous a taſk, that from fear of the accompliſhment, you may not be willing to ſee the neceſſity for undertaking it; or, which, for

want of clearer logical ſpectacles, you may not be able to diſcover;—permit me to exemplify it by a more familiar inſtance, which, having a reference to your own perſon, may be to *you*, eaſier of comprehenſion, than any other illuſtration, I could poſſibly produce.

Let us ſuppoſe then, ſome one to maintain,—that *Dr. Prieſtley*, has NOT *given up* all his CAPACITY for REASONING, by that portion of it, which, we find, he has *retained* in his *letters* to *Mr. Burke*.

Now certainly, no one could poſſibly be ſo fooliſh, as to maintain, that *if* you *have* RETAINED "*a capacity for reaſoning*," in thoſe letters;—that you had, when writing them, either *loſt it*, or *given it up*. But, ſtill, there may notwithſtanding, remain, *two* poſſible ſubjects of *diſpute*. For, it is not quite impoſſible,—that ſome ſceptical opponent to your admirer, might DOUBT, whether

whether you *ever had*, or even DENY, that you ever HAD,—at any time,—*any capacity for reaſoning;* or even, if you *had*,—whether, you *retained any*, in your *letters* to *Mr. Burke*. And after reading theſe letters of mine, to which *yours* gave occaſion, ſhould any one be ſo *whimſical*, as to demand of your admirer, PROOFS of theſe points; HE muſt neceſſarily *undertake the Herculean* labour, of exhibiting them, before, he could procure from the objector, any *aſſent*, to his *firſt* poſition. But, *with ſuch a requiſition*, it appears to me, as *difficult*, to find *any man* ABLE to COMPLY; *as* it ſeems *impoſſible*, that YOU ſhould be *capable*, of SATISFYING the *demand*, in the *former* caſe;—for the ſole purpoſe of illuſtrating which, I have introduced, this *latter* inſtance.

As to all your little poppings, in defence of the poſitions, which relate to the *election*, and *dethronement* of *kings*, they were

evidently charges, only of powder. For, all the ſhot, which is alone fitted for the maintenance of ſuch poſts, has been already compleatly deſtroyed, by the long train of artillery, which I arranged, oppoſite to your fort: ſo that it would now be in *me*, a criminal waſte of powder, not only to fire off a ſingle charge, but even to make your ſoldiers wink, by giving them a flaſh in the pan.

But, Sir, there is *one* paſſage in this *illuſtrious* THIRD LETTER, which, though it entirely delivers us from all employment, of the faculty of thinking, for the purpoſe of refuting it; and affords us the moſt *entire diſpenſation*, from all *inveſtigation*, by offering us only, what we have hundreds of times before, both read, heard, reprobated, and deſpiſed; yet,—I can not paſs it by unnoticed; as it gave birth to a reflection, which was to me attended with great pain, though the relation of it,

may

may perhaps, to others, be followed by much benefit.

For, it gave *me* reaſon to lament, that notwithſtanding, the vaſt *labour* you have employed, in *putting together*, ſuch a *multiplicity* of *books*, as, you *have already* FABRICATED, that, you had not, *before* the publication of your letters to *Mr. Burke*, *added* to THEM, *one labour more*. The taſk, I mean,—of *making* an ENGLISH DICTIONARY; for the *benefit* of *yourſelf*, and of *your friends*. For, by *this omiſſion*, you have moſt unluckily *puzzled yourſelf*, and *them*, as to the *meaning* of a *word*,—which is, ONE of the moſt COMMON in the ENGLISH language; and even denotes a perſon, exerciſing an office,—which is of daily, and hourly uſe, to the *generality* of the world. Not to keep you longer in ſuſpence, —I muſt inform, you,—it is,—the word,—SERVANT.

Now,

Now, Sir, becauſe, it is the *duty* of the KING, a MAGISTRATE, &c. to *do good*, or, to *render ſervice* to the *people*, who are *intruſted* to *their care; therefore*, you and your friends maintain,—that, *they* are the SERVANTS of the *people*.

I muſt confeſs, that for ſome time, I thought,—this expreſſion, was intended, only, as an *harmleſs pun;* by which, you might hope to rouſe your readers, from any inclination to ſleep, or propenſity to drowſineſs; or by which, you might expect to relieve them from fatigue, or even perhaps, to ſoften their features, into a ſmile. But, however true it may poſſibly be,—that it has produced BOTH of thoſe effects, upon *ſome* of them; yet,—that no ſuch conſequence, was *intended* by *you*, I am *now perfectly convinced*,—from the moſt accurate attention, to the uniform gravity, and conſtant ſolemnity of your diction. For, even when you tell us, that KINGS are the *ob-*

jects

jects of *your laughter;* your words have not the leaſt tendency, to move a ſingle muſcle, in the face of any other man; except, it ſhould chance to be, *at*,—and not, *with* YOU.

I muſt beg leave therefore, juſt to obſerve, that however, *I might* be inclined to concur with you, in a *ſerious* application, of the *term*,—SERVANT, to the KING, *could* it be CONFINED to *his office ſingly*, without being extended to others;—yet, I muſt confeſs, I feel ſome reluctance, to the adoption of ſuch an application of it; becauſe, men are ſo prone to err, that ſome of them, would then perhaps imagine that it may with *equal*, or even *ſtill greater* propriety, be applied, both, to YOU, and ME. And though, for my own part, I am totally indifferent, as to *any diminution of reſpect*, which might chance to be the *conſequence*, of *ſuch* an application to *myſelf*;—yet, I ſhould be extremely ſorry,

on

on *your* account; if, any, of *your own* congregation, ſhould treat YOU with only *half the contempt*, by conſidering *you*, as THEIR SERVANT; that YOU do a *king*,—by conſidering HIM, as YOURS.

Beſides, if this were to be the caſe, the very nature of the *relation*, between you, and your flock, would moſt unfortunately, be totally reverſed. For then, it would be *their office* to *teach*, and *yours* to *learn*. It would be *their duty* to *preach*, and *yours* to *hear*. It would then, be *their* RIGHT to *iſſue out their commands* to YOU, and *your* DUTY TO OBEY THEIR INSTRUCTIONS.

But, how diſagreeable, and irkſome, *ſuch* a ſituation muſt *neceſſarily* be to *you*; I can eaſily conceive, from that *noble freedom of ſpirit*, which breaths through *all* your writings; and which ſo irrefragably proves,—that you would ſpurn with indignation, at the

the *very idea*, of *ſubmitting* to *any man's direction*, or even of *acknowledging*, *any man*, as your *ſuperior*.

But, that ſuch, would *ſoon* be the *horrible* ſtate of *ſubjection*, to which you would be reduced, if your congregations, ſhould *once* give the ſame appellation to *you*, which,—you do,—to the *king*,—is not merely a theoretical conjecture, but is a fact, which may be ſaid to be ſanctioned, by experience.

For, I know from the information, of ſome of the *miniſters* of your *perſuaſion*, that this is the ACTUAL ſtate of ſlavery, to which, *ſome* of *them*, have been already reduced. Of which, they complained to me, as a burden too grievous to be borne, and which therefore, they lamented as the heavieſt of afflictions. Now, Sir, if the whole multitude of *Unitarian* congregations, ſhould once univerſally *add* to their other enlightened tenet,

 that

that *Jeſus Chriſt* is to be treated *only* as a *mere man*, this alſo,—that their *miniſters* are to be treated *only* as *mere ſervants*;—how miſerable then would be your condition. And in the inſtances, to which I allude, where, *ſuch* has been the PRACTICE of ſome congregations, they were certainly thoſe, *who had embraced* the THEORY. For *they*, it ſeems, were juſt as *incapable* as *you*,—of conceiving the *palpable difference*, and *diſtinction*,—there is,—between,—the DOING ANOTHER A SERVICE,—and,—the BEING HIS SERVANT. Hence therefore, they thought themſelves authoriſed, to *compel their miniſters*, (under the penalty of the loſs of their *wages*) to preach SUCH DOCTRINES, as the *richeſt* and *greateſt*, though not perhaps, the *wiſeſt* members of the congregation, ſhould pleaſe to COMMAND; and reſtrained them from preaching *ſuch*, as the MINISTERS, would *themſelves* have *choſen*.

I will therefore beg leave, Sir, with all due deference, to ſubmit, and leave the queſtion, entirely to your own determination. viz. Whether,—*as* KINGS are *no more bound* to OBEY the COMMANDS of *their* SUBJECTS, than YOU ARE *thoſe* of *your* AUDITORS;—it may not be,—in YOU, —*as juſt* and *as right*,—*as proper* and *as decent*,—*as humble* and *as rational*,—*not* to give the appellation of SERVANT, to a KING,—as,—it is in your CONGREGATION, —NOT to give it,—to YOU.

There are, Sir, likewiſe, ſome other paſſages, in *this* very letter of yours, to which, I am now paying my reſpects; which indiſputably prove,—that had it been preceded by the manufacture of that very uſeful, but deſpiſed work,—a *dictionary*, it muſt neceſſarily have contained fewer apparent errors; and would have been of ineſtimable advantage to your *friends*. They being, I am perſuaded, as much determin-

ed, *not* to *unlearn* any thing, which they fancy, they have been taught by *you*; as *you* can poſſibly be reſolved, not even to *examine* the *truth* of any poſition, which *you* imagine, *you* have *learned* from Mr. LOCKE. The *principle*, is the ſame in *both*; though to be ſure, the *authorities*, are *ſomewhat different*.

For, you proceed to cenſure the expreſſion, of—"OUR SOVEREIGN LORD "THE KING," though only indeed, upon *political* principles. But, as ſome of your *eleves* condemn it likewiſe, upon *religious* ones, I doubt not, but *you* alſo have the *ſame* objection to it; though both, I am certain, highly venerate the title,—of—"THE MAJESTY OF THE PEOPLE."

You are of opinion, that the *firſt* term, if it ought to be uſed at all, ſhould be applied to the *parliament*.

Now,

Now, if you mean by *this word*,—only, —the HOUSES OF LORDS, and COMMONS; had you but conſulted ſome *Encyclopædia*, which you muſt *neceſſarily* have done, upon every *principle* of *book-making*, had you undertaken to manufacture a *new dictionary*; —you would moſt probably, never have urged this objection. For then, you muſt have been uncommonly unfortunate indeed, had you not learned from ſome one, or other of them, that the *Lords* and *Commons*, are only portions of the legiſlature; but, that the KING HIMSELF, alſo, forms, a conſtituent part of the legiſlative body. That every law therefore, requires *his aſſent*, as much as the aſſents of the two houſes: And his NEGATIVE, is as perfectly CONSTITUTIONAL, for the REJECTION of an act, as that, of a MAJORITY, in *either* houſe. You would then alſo have known, that, when we ſpeak of the KING AS OUR SOVEREIGN LORD; we do not, by that expreſſion characteriſe him, as a *part* of the

the *legiſlature*, but as POSSESSING *compleatly in himſelf*, the WHOLE EXECUTIVE POWER of the kingdom; and therefore, that IT IS A TITLE, to which, the PARLIAMENT, in *no ſenſe*, in which, you can poſſibly *take* that *word*, can have any more claim, than, even the *revolution ſociety*; or, as Mr. Burke calls it, the "*ſociety for revo-*" *lutions.*"

By the *ſame* means, you would moſt probably have removed alſo, any *religious ſcruples*, which *you* may entertain, as well as your diſciples,—as to the propriety of the *ſame* title.

For, no doubt, but you might then have gleaned up, at leaſt, *ſo much* acquaintance with *logic*, as would have imparted to you, *ſome* knowledge of the *proper* uſe, and *ſignification* of WORDS; and taught you, that the *very ſame epithets*, *may*, by their application to *different ſubjects*,—*receive*, from the

ſubjects

ſubjects themſelves, either, an *enlargement*, or *limitation* to their ſignifications. Conſequently therefore, though it would undoubtedly be blaſphemy in us, to call the KING, OUR SOVEREIGN LORD GOD;—yet, it is certainly, not at all inconſiſtent with *piety*, with *innocence*, and *good ſenſe*, to call HIM, OUR SOVEREIGN LORD THE KING.

And indeed, where, even cuſtom only, in a ſtate had authoriſed, or ſanctioned *ſuch* a *title*;—to withold it, is even to diſobey an authority, which I hope you will pardon me for thinking;—though I differ from *you* in opinion,—*ſtill greater*, than even *yours*. I mean, a learned ancient writer, called an Apoſtle, notwithſtanding *you*, have diſcovered *his miſtakes*;—who, has recommended to us,—I dare not, for fear of *offence*,—ſay,—*enjoined us*;—"to "*pay cuſtom, to whom cuſtom is due, and* "*honour, to whom honour.*"

You

You object indeed, I know, for, ſo you have yourſelf told us,—to *ſuch titles*, becauſe, you think,—they are apt to inflate KINGS with PRIDE. But is not *this* a *paſſion*, which, it is as neceſſary to be guarded againſt,—for the ſake of the peace, comfort, and happineſs of ſociety,—in SUBJECTS, *as* well as in KINGS. And will *you* then, that you may act conſiſtently, withold from *every* man, of any other rank, *his* title, from the fear, that the beſtowing it, might excite the ſame paſſion in *him*.

Some men, for inſtance, *may be proud* of the *title*,—of REVEREND DOCTOR,—however it may have been *acquired*, or whatever *right* they may *have* to it, or to whatever *rank*, they may be *entitled* to derive from it, in this kingdom; where almoſt every poor curate, has an unqueſtionable right to a rank, *ſuperior* to numbers of thoſe, who happen, to be *ſo* dignified. But, were *he* to attempt to aſſume it, he would

would ſoon be abaſhed into humiliation, by the ſupercilious brows of thoſe, who, notwithſtanding treat with *contempt*, the *titles* of KINGS. Nay, though *you yourſelf*, may totally *diſregard* the *recommendation* of the APOSTLE, give me leave to aſk you, this queſtion, whether, *even* YOU, Sir, would not have thought *me*,—if I had not addreſſed you,—*as*, THE REVEREND DOCTOR PRIESTLEY,—to have been GUILTY, at *leaſt*, of a BREACH of GOOD MANNERS.

From hence then, it clearly follows, that you yourſelf muſt not only deem *that* man, if not ignorant of the rules, yet, however, to be deficient in the practice of good-breeding, who is ſo tenacious of his own perſonal conſequence, as to refuſe to others, the titles and places, which are *really due* to them; *but him* alſo, who even refuſes them to others,—from *courteſy*, which they ought

 not,

not, though they often do claim, as a RIGHT.

I doubt not therefore, but that you likewiſe think, that *good manners* are of much more conſequence, to the comfort of individuals; and of much more importance to ſociety; than ſome are apt to conceive; and conſequently, that there are claſſes of people, who pay a much leſs attention to it, as a part of *education*, than it deſerves. As it certainly tends, to baniſh rudeneſs and ferociouſneſs from ſociety, and to produce the ſame OUTWARD ACTS of kindneſs, gentleneſs, and humility, which chriſtianity upon a different, and better principle, enjoins. So that the humbleſt and beſt *chriſtian*, is in fact, the *beſt bred* gentleman.

Never therefore, I am certain, ſhall we diſcover in future, any inclination in you, and your friends, to withhold

hold from others, thoſe titles, which, the *rites* and *cuſtoms* of a ſtate, authoriſe any rank to aſſume. Since it is evident, that whoever feels *that inclination*, is actuated by the very *ſame* paſſion, which inſtigates the *poſſeſſors* of titles, to *pride* themſelves upon them. Convinced, as you undoubtedly are, that whoever refuſes to another, the appellation or the rank, which is due to him; can only be deemed as a counterpart to ſurly *Diogenes*, trampling, with *Cynic arrogance* upon the *carpets* of that *Plato*; who was as much ſuperior to the *philoſophers* of old, and alſo, of *this enlightened age*, in the *manners* of a gentleman; as,—in the brilliancy, and copiouſneſs of his imagination;—the vivacity, and extent of his ſagacity;—and the importance, and profundity of his diſcoveries.

As to that expreſſion, which is ſo great a favourite with ſome philoſophers, and undoubtedly, not leſs ſo with the VUL-

GAR, for it is to them, the title belongs, —I mean, "THE MAJESTY OF THE PEO-"PLE;"—had you undertaken the taſk, of which I lament the want of execution;—the explanation of this term, would ſoon have been very eaſy to you; and you would, I doubt not, readily have ſeen, the abſurdity and contradiction, which, it involves. For, though I do not think, that *any dictionary-maker*, has *yet* been ſo *enlightened*, as to join theſe words together, as a *well-known title*; or even quoted any paſſage, from any *enlightened* writer, to authoriſe ſuch a junction; yet, to have diſcovered the beautiful ANTITHESIS, which they form *both* in *ſenſe* and *ſound*, there would have been no occaſion for you, to have had recourſe to the ingenious *Chambers*, nor the ſtill more valuable *Scotch Encyclopædia*, now publiſhing; but, you might have made the diſcovery, from the very firſt ſchool-boy's dictionary, you had taken

taken up; if, his moiſtened thumb, had not torn off, or obliterated, the words.

For at what time, could this ſame much-talked of MAJESTY, be breathed into the people? Not ſurely, in a *ſtate* of *nature*, when no government exiſts,—but each man is enjoying his NATURAL RIGHTS of FREEDOM and EQUALITY, for the DESTRUCTION of each other? Was it then, when no longer able to ſupport, ſo miſerable a ſtate of exiſtence, they were ſeeking to get rid of THEIR OWN SELF-DIRECTION, by ſubmitting, to almoſt *any* man, who would take upon him the labour, of GOVERNING them? Was it in either of theſe ſituations? If it were. However glorious, ſuch ſtates may appear to modern philoſophers, in theſe *enlightened times*, THEY,—the PEOPLE,—evidently preferred *ſubmiſſion* to a GOVERNOR, to *any* SUCH MAJESTY. Experience, having ſoon taught them, from THEIR OWN INCAPACITY,—for ſuch

ſuch a choice; that it was much better to truſt, to the ſeeming caſual ſucceſſion of nature, than to their own ignorant ſelection. Little dreaming I ween, at *that* time, that, they were thus ſurrendering up THEIR MAJESTY, of which, they had never heard.

Or was it, AFTER THEY HAD SUBMITTED, and were BOUND to OBEY the WILL, or WILLS of others? If *this* be the TIME meant; had you, but taken the method I have propoſed, and which I lament, did *not* occur to your thoughts; had you but looked out, only,—the words, *majeſty*, *ſovereignty*, *government*, *obedience*, and *ſubjects*, you would have ſeen clearly, the abſurdity, and contradiction, of ſuch a phraſe. When therefore, you had heard, ſuch an expreſſion uſed, at the *revolution ſociety*; your eye-brows, would ſpontaneouſly have expreſſed the contempt, you inwardly felt; and you would have been more diſpoſed,

had

had it been conſiſtent with *your good manners*, to have hiſſed the perſons, who gave ſuch nonſenſe for a toaſt; than to applaud it, and drink it, perhaps,—"WITH "THREE TIMES THREE."

By this time I think, even YOU, Sir, muſt ſee *clearly*, how very neceſſary it is, that men, ſhould moſt accurately examine, and moſt preciſely conceive the MEANING of WORDS; before they can pretend, to lay any claim to the character of REASONERS; or can form any pretence, to rank themſelves, in the number of WRITERS, SPEAKERS, or of CRITICS. From the want of this habit, which muſt be the *ſubſtratum* of every *good* compoſition,—it is,—that we may often hear a man ſpeaking fluently for an hour, when to all the purpoſes of inſtruction, he has really been ſaying nothing; or read a folio, which though it coſt the author, the labour of years to write, truly eſtabliſhes no other proof,

proof,—than this;—that the writer, has *proved nothing*. For, when by an accurate ſcrutiny, into a fundamental propoſition, we have once found, that the ſpeaker, or the writer, had no clear conception of the terms, by which, it was compacted, and we have ourſelves diſcovered, their true and proper ſignification, we ſhall ſee the ſpeech, or the book, at once loſe it's only principle of coheſion, and crumble into duſt.

That you were not indeed *much ſooner* aware of the neceſſity for this practice, and did not moſt ſedulouſly endeavour to cultivate it; I have the pleaſure of thinking, was owing in no fault in me, but is wholly to be imputed, to your own neglect. For, *above twenty years* ago, I not only pointed *this*, out to you, but alſo, moſt ſeriouſly adviſed and intreated you, to give a cloſe attention, to the *ſtudy* of *every branch* of the *art* of LOGIC, not indeed,

indeed, that you might improve, but that you might acquire a talent for ratiocination. And, the *more* clearly to *evince* to you, the extreme want, and abſolute neceſſity you were under, of following this advice, I exhibited to you, the moſt *direct*, and *ſtrongeſt* proof;—by writing a little eſſay, entitled PRIESTLEY, *againſt* PRIESTLEY, and ſhowing, from your deficiency in theſe reſpects, in *your eſſay upon government*, HOW YOU YOURSELF,—CONFUTED YOURSELF.

Upon this occaſion indeed, a perſon who called himſelf *Eberacenſis*, threw down his gauntlet, and denied, that I had proved the charge. He certainly advanced to the combat, with much ſeeming ſpirit, but with great real weakneſs; with a confidence, which nothing but ability, could have juſtified, but with ſuch powers, as only the moſt baſhful modeſty, could have ſuited. The very

firſt onſet brought him breathleſs, and ſenſeleſs, to the ground; never more to riſe. And I ſuppoſe, that by this time, at leaſt, you recognize in me,—if you did not before,—a certain writer,—who formerly aſſumed, the name,—of *Ariſtarchus*.

But perhaps, you miſtook me for an enemy, and therefore were reſolved, not to pay any regard, to *my advice*. Should you however, plead *this* as an excuſe, you muſt yourſelf be ſenſible, that it can not by any means, prove your juſtification. For, you can not poſſibly, have ſo far forgotten the rudiments of your education, as not to remember, that—*fas eſt et ab hoſte doceri*. Your conduct therefore, was as impolitic, as your ſuppoſition was ill-founded. For, what poſſible advantage could accrue to any *enemy*, by *recommending* any thing, which, muſt neceſſarily conduce to *your good;* and poſſibly, to his own injury. But with the moſt unfeigned

unfeigned truth, I can aſſure you; that if you *did really*, or *do now*, ſo eſteem me, you do me great injuſtice, and are yourſelf much miſtaken. I can moſt ſolemnly affirm, that there never was, *that man* exiſting in the world, for whom I ever entertained the leaſt diſlike, becauſe, we differed in opinion, or diſagreed in ſentiment. For, it is almoſt impoſſible to conceive, a greater contrariety of opinions, to ſubſiſt between two men, who were both warmly attached, to the truth of chriſtianity, than between me, and my late moſt excellent friend,—Dr. John Jebb; whom I believe you well knew, and highly valued; yet, —we lived in the moſt uninterrupted harmony with each other,—from the commencement of our acquaintance in the univerſity, to the day of his death; though we never met without diſputing, and by the account of his life, I find, we were once warmly engaged againſt each other, in a

public controverſy. Which, had I at *that time* known, ſhould have borne ſome marks of the ſincere affection, with which, I loved the man, whatever might be the earneſtneſs, with which I attacked the arguments of the writer.

For, never ſhall I ceaſe to cheriſh the ſweet remembrance of him here,—and,—O! —that I may be deemed worthy to live with him, in eternal friendſhip hereafter. Many there were, who did injuſtice to his character, whilſt living, and who, now ſtill know not, one half of his real worth. For, he having early in life, imbibed ſome ſtrong prejudices on religious ſubjects,—his habits and connections, led him rather to cheriſh them; than afterwards, to employ his own excellent underſtanding, in examining, and eradicating them. And, as his honeſt heart, was always warm in defence of the ſentiments which he embraced;

ced; he was ſometimes led by his attachment to others, to *appear to ſome* as a *fiery zealot* for his opinions; who in reality, would not deſignedly have given a moment's pain to any, the meaneſt ſenſitive creature. For, no man ever poſſeſſed, *more "of the milk of human kindneſs,"* and never did I know, amongſt *men*, (for I muſt mark that diſtinction) a purer ſpirit, —wafted to heaven.—Pardon this digreſſion, and permit me,—that,—

His ſaltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani
Munere.

But, Sir, from this pleaſing,—ſad remembrance, I muſt once more turn my ſteps, to the thorny paths of controverſy; though they will not at preſent be detained, but for ſome few minutes, longer.

Pardon me then, Sir, that if,—well knowing the "*rapid glances*," you are wont to take

take of books, I requeſt the favour of you, and can aſſure you, that *this requeſt* is made, as much for *your benefit*, as, *my own;*—that,—when you do me the honour, of reading theſe letters,—you would be ſo good,—as moſt *attentively* to peruſe them,—TWICE at LEAST,—before, you undertake to anſwer them. Becauſe otherwiſe, moſt probably, your ſtatement of my opinion, will, through inattention, be a miſrepreſentation, and then inſtead of engaging with *me*, you will be fighting only with the air. For, as it is impoſſible for you, to *reply* to MY ARGUMENTS, if you have not allowed yourſelf, TIME ſufficient to *underſtand* them; and *ſuch* a *reply*, conſtitutes the very ESSENCE of all CONTROVERSY; YOU will be under the NECESSITY, of having recourſe to your moſt uſual mode, —of *calling* THAT an ANSWER,—which,—without even aiming, at a REFUTATION of your opponent's REASONING,—contains merely,—

merely,—a RE-CAPITULATION, and RE-ASSERTION, of *your own opinions*. A mode of proceeding, which I can aſſure you, has ſuch an effect upon ſome *acute reaſoners*, as to produce in them inſtantly,—a *nauſea*, at the very ſight of any of your works.

Be ſo good therefore, I beſeech you, as to exert your own utmoſt endeavours, and even call to your aid, all the aſſiſtance you can procure, that inſtead of taking the meaning of my terms for granted,—you may be enabled,—moſt attentively to inveſtigate the *ſignification* of *every word* I have uſed, in *every propoſition*, which I have advanced; and inſtead of contenting yourſelf, with REPROBATING my CONCLUSIONS, WITHOUT PROOF of THEIR being DESERVING of CENSURE, be pleaſed with the *utmoſt ſeverity* to *ſcrutiniſe* the *chain* which *connects*, the CONCLUSIONS, WITH THEIR RESPECTIVE PREMISES. For, theſe are

the

the only effectual means, by which, you can either DESTROY my ſyſtem, or that you can REBUILD *Mr. Locke's*.

It is to erect, or repair, a fit habitation for TRUTH, that is,—or ought to be, our primary object. And though ſhe is then placed in a manſion moſt ſuitable to her dignity, when it is like thoſe, which a *Plato* or a *Burke* has erected for her, ornamented with the fineſt poliſhed marble pillars of the Corinthian order; yet, will ſhe notwithſtanding, ſometimes deign to dwell in an humble cottage, ſupported merely by wooden pillars roughly hewn out of oak, and wrought only in ruſtic work.

That I might, the ſooner, give you an opportunity of attempting to execute this work, ſo far at leaſt as relates to CIVIL GOVERNMENT, well knowing how impatient you are, under any deprivation of labour;

bour; I have divided this correſpondence, —into TWO PARTS; that you might not be robbed of the pleaſure of returning an anſwer, 'till *that time* was elapſed, which, it would be requiſite for me, to employ in writing the *ſecond* part.

I well know, with what agility and pleaſure, you always advance to the fight; and with what tardineſs, and reluctancy, you retire. The nimbleneſs of the one, I have been ſometimes induced to think, ſhows more ſpirit, than policy. But the ſlowneſs of the latter, can not be accuſed of want of art; however, ſome may have ſuſpected it of the appearance of vanity. For, often have we ſeen *you*, not only like *Antæus*, as ſoon as you have been thrown upon the earth, inſtantly rebound, with renewed ſtrength: But even,—when your adverſary, has like another *Hercules*, *really vanquiſhed* you, and ſuffered your *lifeleſs* corpſe, to fall to the ground;—we have

likewiſe ſeen you riſe once more, re-animated with your former confidence;—and when you knew the conqueror was certainly retired from the field, never more meaning to return;—we have heard you challenge him again to the combat, ſing a triumphal ſong, and claim the wreath of victory,—as if *you* were really the victor, not the vanquiſhed.

I am, Sir,

Your very humble Servant,

S. COOPER.

END OF THE FIRST PART.

ERRATA.

Page 2, l. 12, between the words, *to* and *even*, inſert '*almoſt.*'
Page 18, l. 4, in the note, inſert, between *when* and *they*, '*even.*'

Shortly will be publiſhed, by the ſame Author.

An INTRODUCTION to the STUDY of the NEW TESTAMENT, in which, amongſt ſeveral other ſubjects of Enquiry, the true diſtinction between the INTERNAL and EXTERNAL EVIDENCES of Chriſtianity, is, (in oppoſition to the opinions of ſome very eminent writers) endeavoured to be more accurately explained then it has hitherto been, and the PRINCIPLES of Mr. Hume's Philoſophy, from which he deduced his Arguments againſt MIRACLES as proofs of a Divine Revelation, are ſhown to be contrary to the firſt Principles of our Knowledge, as deduced from EXPERIENCE and TESTIMONY.

Publiſhed by the ſame Author.

I. The Neceſſity and Duty of the early Inſtruction of Children, in the Chriſtian Religion, evinced and enforced;—Preached in the Pariſh Church of Great Yarmouth, on Sunday, June the 20th, 1790; For the Benefit of the Charity and Sunday Schools. Printed at the Requeſt of the Repreſentatives in Parliament, for that Burgh,

II. The

II. The Conſiſtency of Man's, Free-Agency, with God's Fore-knowledge in the Government of the World, proved and illuſtrated. In a Diſcourſe;—Preached in the Pariſh Church of Great Yarmouth, on Thurſday, April 23d, 1789; being the Day of General Thankſgiving, for his Majeſty's Happy Recovery.

III. The One Great Argument for the truth of Chriſtianity, from a ſingle Prophecy, evinced, in a new Explanation of the Seventh Chapter of Iſaiah: and in a general Refutation of the Interpretations of former Commentators.

IV. Conſolation to the Mourner, and Inſtruction both to Youth aud Old Age, from the early Death of the Righteous. In Two Diſcourſes;—occaſioned by the Death of his eldeſt Daughter, who had only juſt entered into her Twenty-firſt Year;—To which is ſubjoined, an Appendix, containing her Character, and two Elegies on her Death. Preached at the Pariſh Church of Great Yarmouth.

V. Erroneous Opinions concerning Providence refuted,—the true Notions ſtated,—and illuſtrated by the Events which have lately happened

to

to this Nation. Preached at the Pariſh Church of Great Yarmouth, on Friday, February 8th, 1782.

VI. An Addreſs after Confirmation:—Pointing out the Means of attaining Chriſtian Perfection, and true Happineſs. Delivered at the Pariſh Church of Great Yarmouth, on Sunday, Auguſt 24th, 1783.

VII. The Power of Chriſtianity, over the malignant Paſſions aſſerted; the real Cauſes of Perſecutions amongſt Chriſtians are pointed out, and the true Grounds of mutual Forbearance in religious Opinions explained. Preached Nov. 3d, 1776.

VIII. The Neceſſity and Truth of the Three Principal Revelations, demonſtrated from the Gradations of Science, and the Progreſs of the mental Faculties. Preached on Commencement Sunday, June 29th, 1777.

IX. A Letter to the Clergy of Norfolk, upon the Abolition of Tythes. In which, the Schemes propoſed for an Equivalent, are examined.

X. A full Refutation of the Reaſons advanced in Defence of the Petition, for the Abolition of

of Subſcription to the Articles and Liturgy. By no Bigot to, nor againſt the Church of England.

XI. Explanations of different texts of Scriptures, in four Diſſertations; 1ſt. On eternal Puniſhments.—2d. On Chriſt's curſing the Fig-Tree. 3d. On Miſtranſlations.—4th. On Chriſt's Temptation;—in which, the Notions of a Viſion, and the perſonal Appearance of Satan, are refuted.

XII. A Letter to the Biſhop of Glouceſter;—in which his Lordſhip's DIVINE LEGATION is defended, both from the Miſapprehenſions of his Lordſhip's Friends, and Miſrepreſentations of his Enemies.

XIII. Definitions and Axioms, relative to Charity, Charitable Inſtitutions, and the Poor's Laws. In which, Houſes of Induſtry were firſt recommended to the Attention of the Public.

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
305 De Neve Drive - Parking Lot 17 • Box 951388
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90095-1388
Return this material to the library from which it was borrowed.

OCT 16 2003

Q

F

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 011 471 0